

Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

out of the disaster loan revolving fund, in any area where the Secretary finds need for agricultural credit which could not otherwise be met, until June 30, 1955 (p. 7327). The Senate has passed S. 3245 on the same subject, but the language is somewhat different.

12. TOBACCO QUOTAS. Passed with amendment S. 3050, to increase (from 40% to 50% of the average market price) the penalty for marketing of tobacco in excess of marketing quotas. Agreed to an amendment by Rep. Deane to make the bill effective Dec. 1 instead of Oct. 1. (p. 7331.)
13. LABOR-HEW APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955. The Appropriations Committee reported this bill, H. R. 9447, without amendment on June 4, while the House was in adjournment (p. 7370).
14. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955. House conferees were appointed on this bill, H. R. 8583 (p. 7320). Senate conferees have been appointed.
15. PERSONNEL. Received the Post Office and Civil Service Committee's reports on appeals and grievance procedures in the Federal Government (H. Rept. 1759) and the first intermediate report by the Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization (H. Rept. 1760) (p. 7370).
Rep. Moss spoke in favor of a payraise for Federal classified employees "at least equal to the 7 percent raise granted Post Office Department employees in the bill already reported out by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee" (p. 7343).
16. VETERANS' BENEFITS. Passed without amendment S. 1823, to give to veterans of the Korean conflict the same credit for military service toward meeting the requirements of the homestead laws as is now given to veterans of World War II (pp. 7328-9). This bill will now be sent to the President.
17. FORESTRY. Rep. Ellsworth, and others, discussed H. R. 5958, to settle the jurisdictional question between this Department and the Interior Department over "controverted" Oregon and California timberlands, and at the request of Rep. Miller (Nebr.) it was stricken from the Consent Calendar. Rep. Miller indicated that the bill would be referred to the Rules Committee. (p. 7329).
Passed as reported S. 1399, to authorize sale of certain improvements on national forest land in Arizona to the Salt River Valley Water Users Association (pp. 7330-1).
18. LAND TRANSFER. Passed without amendment H. J. Res. 458, to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim retained rights in a tract of land to the Board of Education of Irwin County, Ga. (p. 7331).
19. BANKING AND CURRENCY. Rep. Patman claimed the Federal Reserve Board should be required to support Government bonds at par (pp. 7348-65).
20. ELECTRIFICATION. Passed with amendment S. 3090, to authorize the transmission and disposition by the Secretary of the Interior of electric energy generated at Falcon Dam on the Rio Grande with provision for preference to REA cooperatives and others (pp. 7329-30).
21. EDUCATION. Rep. Brown (Ga.) spoke on the importance of the vocational educational program, and favored appropriation of the full amount authorized by the George-Barden Act for this purpose (pp. 7344-5).

22. HOUSING LOANS. Rep. Fisher objected to a conference on H. R. 7839, which includes a provision continuing the rural-housing loan program (p. 7340).
23. SOCIAL SECURITY. Rep. Reed (N.Y.) inserted a comparative analysis of present law and the changes proposed thereto by H. R. 7199 and H. R. 9366, to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code so as to extend coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance program to other groups, including self-employed farmers and additional farm workers, etc. (pp. 7311-8).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

24. DAIRY INDUSTRY. Rep. Springer inserted a Department summary of dairy price support purchases and uses in May 1954 (p. A4196).
Rep. Harden inserted a Country Gentleman article discussing the dairy industry problem and stating that "There are two ways to get out of it--produce less or sell more milk" (p. A4198).
25. SOIL CONSERVATION. Sen. Johnson, Tex., inserted an article briefly outlining the work during the last 14 years of the first soil conservation district established in Tex. (pp. A4202-3).
26. FORESTRY. Rep. Ellsworth inserted an American Forests magazine article explaining "why full crop development based upon full crop utilization has become the guide-post in Douglas-fir region forestry" (pp. A4213-5).
27. SOCIAL SECURITY. Speech of Rep. Vursell stating, "I am concerned and doubt the wisdom of the inclusion of self-employed farmers under social security" (p. A4216).
28. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Butler, Nebr., inserted his statement commending the progress made by REA under the present administration (pp. A4217-8).

BILLS INTRODUCED

29. ANIMAL FOOD. H.R. 9448, by Rep. Bailey, to amend the act of May 29, 1884, as amended, the act of Feb. 2, 1903, as amended, the act of Mar. 3, 1905, as amended, and the first proviso under the heading "General Expenses, Bureau of Animal Industry" in the act of June 30, 1914, as amended, to include all domestic animals within their provisions; to Agriculture Committee (p. 7370).
30. DAIRY INDUSTRY. H.R. 9450, by Rep. Bow, to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce, to stabilize prices of milk and dairy products, to impose a stabilization fee on the marketing of milk and butterfat; to Agriculture Committee (p. 7370).
31. FARM LANDS. H.R. 9454, by Rep. Harrison, Wyo., to amend section 4 of the act of Aug. 13, 1953, relating to the exchange of farm units on Federal irrigation projects; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (p. 7370).
32. WATER RESOURCES. H.R. 9459, by Rep. Miller, Nebr., to authorize the Sec. of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Alaska; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (p. 7370).

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED INDEPENDENT AGEN- CIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955

JUNE 4, 1954.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State
of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. BUSBEY, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the
following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 9447]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, the National Labor Relations Board, the National Mediation Board including the National Railroad Adjustment Board, the Railroad Retirement Board, and the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

The budget estimates forming the primary bases of consideration by the committee will be found in the budget for 1955 on the following pages:

	<i>Pages</i>
Department of Labor.....	832 to 850, inclusive
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.....	644 to 707, "
National Labor Relations Board.....	135 to 136, "
National Mediation Board.....	136 to 137, "
Railroad Retirement Board.....	140 to 141, "
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....	119 to 120, "

The committee also considered supplemental requests for 1955 contained in House Documents 386 and 393.

The detailed tabulation at the end of this report reflects each amount included in the bill for 1955, the corresponding budget estimate, and the amounts available for the fiscal year 1954, with appropriate comparisons.

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES AND APPROPRIATIONS

The requests from the agencies for which funds are provided in the bill totaled \$1,965,285,261, a decrease of \$285,904,000 from the amount appropriated for the fiscal year 1954. The committee has reduced the total requests by \$16,339,250, and recommends a total appropriation of \$1,948,946,011, which is \$302,243,250 less than the amount appropriated for 1954. The following table breaks down these totals by departments and independent agencies included in the bill:

Department or agency	Appropriations, 1954	Budget estimates, 1955	Bill for 1955	Bill for 1955 compared with—	
				Appropriations, 1954	Budget estimates, 1955
Department of Labor	\$310, 233, 000	\$299, 635, 000	\$298, 704, 000	—\$11, 529, 000	—\$331, 000
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.....	1, 927, 432, 261	1, 652, 509, 261	1, 637, 615, 011	—289, 817, 250	—14, 894, 250
National Labor Relations Board.....	9, 125, 000	8, 700, 000	8, 400, 000	—725, 000	—300, 000
National Mediation Board.....	1, 189, 000	1, 261, 000	1, 217, 000	+28, 000	—44, 000
Railroad Retirement Board.....	[6, 207, 000]	[6, 108, 000]	[6, 108, 000]	[—99, 000]	-----
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....	3, 210, 000	3, 180, 000	3, 010, 000	—200, 000	—170, 000
Total.....	2, 251, 189, 261	1, 965, 285, 261	1, 948, 946, 011	—302, 243, 250	—16, 339, 250

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$1,300,000, a reduction of \$55,000 from the request, and \$50,000 from the appropriation for 1954. The committee has substantially approved the budget as submitted, with the exception of the request of \$114,040 for "International labor affairs." The committee held lengthy hearings on the request for this activity and diligently sought to elicit information from the witnesses that would indicate the need for the funds requested. In light of the paucity of evidence that this activity is of benefit to the laborers of the United States, the committee was hesitant to allow even the amount of \$60,000 which is included in the bill.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$1,450,000, a reduction of \$32,000 from the request, and \$25,000 from the appropriation for 1954.

BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$655,000, a reduction of \$115,000 from the request, and \$45,000 from the appropriation for 1954. The budget included a request for an increase of \$100,000 for a general program aimed at improving the condition of migratory labor. Both the House and the Senate specifically disallowed the increase requested for this activity in the 1954 budget. On reconsideration the committee can see no reason for changing its previous stand. While this problem is, unquestionably, a very important one, there are already many agencies of the federal government doing work in this field. It was not demonstrated that the addition of another group of federal planners and advisors would materially assist in the solution

of this problem. The amount of \$13,763 requested for international labor activities was also disallowed.

BUREAU OF VETERANS' REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$300,000, the amount requested, and the same as the amount appropriated for 1954.

BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$3,100,000, a decrease of \$115,000 from the request, and \$130,000 from the appropriation for 1954.

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$4,650,000, a reduction of \$110,000 from the request, and \$650,000 from the appropriation for 1954. The amount recommended includes \$1,100,000 for the Veterans' Employment Service which is the same amount appropriated for 1954, but \$400,000 above the amount recommended in the budget. It is the committee's opinion that the amount recommended is about the minimum necessary for an effective VES program. When the time comes that the program is not needed, it should be eliminated entirely, but to appropriate for the abbreviated and ineffective program proposed by the budget would have been a waste of funds.

Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration.—The bill includes \$216,400,000, the total amount requested, and an increase of \$12,095,000 above the amount appropriated for 1954. The amount allowed is composed of \$200,000,000 as a base amount and \$16,400,000 as a contingency fund. The base amount is equal to the total amount estimated to be expended in 1954 and is provided on the premise that the total workload in 1955 will be equal to the total workload in 1954. In recognition of the uncertainties involved in predicting this workload, the committee is providing a contingency fund considerably larger than has been provided in past years. The committee has not allowed the requested authority to use the contingency fund to defray the costs of state salary increases. The language of the bill will provide for a continuation of the 1954 policy of requiring that any salary increases be absorbed.

Unemployment compensation for veterans.—The bill includes \$55,600,000, the amount of the budget request, and \$22,300,000 below the appropriation for 1954. The committee is reasonably certain that this amount will not be sufficient for the full fiscal year 1955, but at the time hearings were concluded, no formal estimates of the additional needs were available. These needs will be considered at a later date to assure that every veteran entitled to unemployment compensation will get the full amount due him under the provisions of the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952.

Salaries and expenses, Mexican farm labor program.—The bill includes \$1,521,000, a reduction of \$225,000 from the request, and \$207,000 from the amount appropriated for 1954. The amount approved is the full amount requested, except that no funds are included to cover the cost of medical examinations, estimated at \$225,000. After the budget was prepared, the Comptroller General ruled that these costs are legal charges against the revolving fund

supported by fees charged the growers who use this labor. There is, therefore, no need to include funds for that purpose in this appropriation.

BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$2,030,000, the full amount of the request, and \$30,000 more than was appropriated for 1954.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$5,350,000, a reduction of \$46,000 from the request, and an increase of \$5,000 above the appropriation for 1954.

WOMEN'S BUREAU

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$348,000, the full amount of the request, and a reduction of \$2,000 from the amount appropriated for 1954.

WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$6,000,000, a reduction of \$233,000 from the request, and \$250,000 from the amount appropriated for 1954.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The bill includes \$1,637,615,011, a reduction of \$14,894,250 from the request, and \$289,817,250 from the appropriations for 1954. The substantial decrease in the bill, as compared to the 1954 appropriations, is largely accountable to two items. The greater of these is a reduction of \$198,000,000 in both the request and the amount provided in the bill for "Grants to states for public assistance." This decrease in requirements results from the expiration of the "McFarland amendment" and subsequent reduction in the maximum amount of funds per recipient for which the federal government will be obligated. The second large reduction is for school construction in federally-impacted areas. The bill includes \$55,000,000 less for this program than was appropriated for 1954. The reduction results from changes in the basic legislation and the fact that almost one-half billion dollars have already been provided to alleviate this problem. The remainder of the reduction in funds for the Department is the net result of action on many items, and is set forth by individual appropriation, in the following:

AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

Education of the blind.—The bill includes \$175,000, the full amount of the request, and the same amount as appropriated for 1954.

COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$410,000, the full amount of the request, and the same amount as appropriated for 1954.

Construction.—The bill includes \$259,000, an increase of \$19,000 over the request, and \$218,000 over the amount appropriated for 1954. The request of \$240,000 for the Federal share of the cost of constructing a library-classroom building has been granted in full.

The additional \$19,000 included in the bill is for renovating an existing building to provide more nearly adequate gymnasium facilities. The committee wishes it clearly understood that it considers this only a stopgap measure. It is the strong desire of the committee that the Department review the need for additional construction of buildings at this institution, and be prepared to present a program for the fulfillment of these needs, when hearings are held on the 1956 budget.

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$5,100,000, a reduction of \$100,000 from both the request and the appropriation for 1954.

FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$2,880,000, the full amount of the request, and a reduction of \$224,000 from the amount appropriated for 1954. The reduction below the appropriation for 1954 is more than counter-balanced by an estimated increase in reimbursements. The total amount estimated to be received from all sources in 1955, including this appropriation, is \$4,000,000, compared with \$3,905,350 for 1954.

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$2,720,000, an increase of \$200,000 above the request, and \$185,000 above the appropriation for 1954. The budget submitted to the committee proposed a reduction of \$15,000. The instruction staff, especially in the liberal arts school, is in great need of being strengthened rather than being reduced. In addition, the new Dental Building will be opened this fall which will further increase the need for personnel. In view of these facts the committee believes that the amount provided in the bill is the minimum needed for proper instruction and maintenance and operation of the physical plant.

Construction of buildings.—The bill includes \$4,808,000, an increase of \$100,000 above the request, and \$4,788,000 above the amount appropriated for 1954. The budget included \$4,436,000 for a pre-clinical medical building and \$272,000 for a power substation to enable the University to utilize commercial electric power rather than making extensive additions to their own generating plant. As a result of the committee's attention being called to the need for repairing the power plant, which supplies heat to the University's buildings, the Chairman of the subcommittee made a personal inspection. His report to the committee fully confirmed the claim that rather extensive repairs are badly needed from the point of view both of safety and of efficient operation. The committee has therefore included \$100,000 to defray these necessary expenses.

Liquidation of contract authority.—The bill includes \$1,150,000, an increase of \$900,000 above the request, and \$1,150,000 above the amount appropriated for 1954. The budget included \$250,000 to provide funds for making final payments for construction of the biology-greenhouse building, which is scheduled for completion in fiscal year 1955. Congress has authorized the University to incur obligations and to enter into contracts for the construction of four additional buildings—a law building, an administration building, a

men's dormitory, and an auditorium and fine arts building. The obligational authority granted for these buildings is now impounded by the Bureau of the Budget and no plans for release were included in the budget. This authority was granted in June 1948 for the auditorium and fine arts building, and in June 1949 for the other three. Since that time the existing buildings have, of course, deteriorated still more, so the current need is even greater than at the time Congress authorized this construction. On the basis of recommendations made by the President of the University and a very thorough survey and inspection of the existing buildings by the chairman of the subcommittee, it appears that the most urgent need is for the law building and the administration building. The committee has therefore included \$200,000 and \$700,000, respectively, for these two buildings. This will provide sufficient funds to cover actual expenditures estimated for 1955. The committee will, of course, expect the Bureau of the Budget to release all of the authorized obligational authority for these two buildings.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Promotion and further development of vocational education.—The bill includes \$18,374,511, a reduction of \$298,750 from both the request and the amount appropriated for 1954. Public Law 286 of the first session of the 83d Congress authorized transfers between appropriations for the purpose of providing for penalty-mail costs. Under this authority, there was \$298,750 of this appropriation transferred to other appropriations within the department. Thus, the amount provided in the bill for 1955 is exactly equal to the amount available for this program in 1954.

Further endowment of Colleges of Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts.—The bill includes \$2,501,500, the full amount of the request and the same as the amount appropriated for 1954.

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$2,900,000, a reduction of \$300,000 from the request and the same as the amount appropriated for 1954. An increase of \$200,000 was included in the original budget submission. It was primarily for the purpose of providing additional personnel and printing and binding funds for increased publications activities. The committee questions the need for the quantity of publications currently being produced, and certainly was not favorably impressed with the arguments for an increase. The remaining \$100,000 of increase was requested as a supplement to the budget for work in connection with the school assistance programs (Payments to school districts and Assistance for school construction). The 1954 budget contains more funds for this purpose than have been provided for any previous year. The committee believes that amount is fully adequate.

Payments to school districts.—The bill includes \$55,000,000, a reduction of \$3,500,000 from the request, and \$17,350,000 from the amount appropriated for 1954. The committee was informed that the request for \$58,500,000 took into account all savings which are estimated to result from changes in the basic legislation governing the program, but that the request was based on a continuation of federal activities at the same level. It appears to the committee to be obvious that defense and other federal activities are being, at least slightly, reduced. This will be reflected in a reduction in the re-

quirements for funds under this program. The reduction of approximately 6 percent should leave an ample amount to pay all eligible applicants in full.

Assistance for school construction.—The bill includes \$70,000,000, a reduction of \$4,000,000 from the request and the same as the amount appropriated for 1954. The basic legislation authorizing this program expires this year for applications, and at the end of 1955 for appropriations. At the current time, the Office of Education has several hundred applications. A large percentage of these have not been checked fully to determine the amount of funds for which they are eligible, and it will be several months before that work can be completed. Thus, the request was necessarily based, in part, on a guess as to the amount that would be required to cover the unprocessed applications. Considering this and the fact that all of the funds cannot be obligated until several months hence, when all applications are fully processed, the committee has made a modest reduction in the request. If the Department's guess proves to have been better than the committee's, a supplemental appropriation will be in order any time before July 1, 1955.

The engineering inspection and certain other technical services for this program are rendered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, with funds transferred from the appropriations for school construction. The Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1954, contained \$125,000 for this purpose, to be available from May 11, 1954, to April 1, 1955. The 1955 budget submissions requested authority to transfer \$125,000 from the appropriations for "School construction" for 1953 and 1954, and authority to transfer \$725,000 from this appropriation. The committee was told that the Housing and Home Finance Agency inspectors attempt to inspect every project once every two weeks. Since a professional architect is retained for every project and the local school board will certainly be sufficiently interested to be reasonably certain that their school is being constructed in accordance with the agreed-upon plans and specifications, the majority of the committee is of the opinion that this much additional checking is unnecessary. The bill includes language, making the \$125,000 provided in the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act available until June 30, 1955, and to transfer an additional \$575,000 from this appropriation.

OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Payments to States.—The bill includes \$21,000,000, an increase of \$1,825,000 above the request, and a reduction of \$2,000,000 below the amount appropriated for 1954. The request of \$19,175,000 was calculated to be the maximum that the states would match under the provision that not more than one dollar of federal funds may be granted for each seventy-five cents of state funds provided for the same purpose. By the time of the hearings it was estimated that the states will provide sufficient funds to match \$20,000,000. If the states increased the amount now foreseeable by \$750,000, they would be able to match \$21,000,000 and thus make a total of \$36,750,000 available for the program, which amount is almost exactly equal to the amount available in 1954. The committee is sure that it was the intention of Congress, in placing the matching provision in the 1954 appropriation language, not to reduce the program, but to encourage the states to contribute a more nearly equal share in the financing of

the program. With this in mind, the committee is recommending an increase of \$1,825,000 over the request, hoping and believing that the states will match this amount.

Basic legislative proposals have been submitted to the Congress which would make considerable changes in the total program for vocational rehabilitation and would provide special state matching formulas. Since these proposals are now being studied by the proper legislative committees, this committee has not included any new language in the bill regarding state matching. The committee is of the opinion, however, that the states should eventually match federal funds at least dollar for dollar.

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$620,000, a decrease of \$30,000 from the request, and \$35,500 from the amount appropriated for 1954.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Assistance to States, general.—The bill includes \$13,000,000, a reduction of \$4,665,500 from the request, and \$250,000 from the amount appropriated for 1954. There was some reticence, on the part of the Public Health Service and Departmental witnesses, to discuss candidly the method used in arriving at the estimate for this appropriation. It was clear, however, that there was a definite connection between the reductions of \$1,976,500 in grants budgeted for Venereal disease control and \$2,275,000 in grants budgeted for Tuberculosis control, and the increase of \$4,251,500 in grants under this item. The committee looks with strong disfavor on such lumping of these grants. If a disease for which special grants have been provided is on the decline, those grants should be reduced or eliminated, rather than being transferred to a general fund. On the other hand, if a disease is of sufficient national importance for the federal government to make grants-in-aid for its control, then the Congress should have control over the amount of such grants for that specific disease. The committee acted on the three appropriations discussed above, on the basis of the internal appropriation structure for 1954, rather than the consolidated approach used in the budget for 1955. Thus, \$3,200,000 of the \$4,665,500 reduction made from the request for this item was restored to the appropriations for Venereal disease control and Tuberculosis control.

Grants to states for public health purposes are included in six separate appropriations. Since each of these appropriations also includes funds for direct operations of the Public Health Service, it is not possible to determine the amount of such grants from the bill. The following tabulation is therefore presented to show the approximate amount included in the bill for all grants to states compared with the appropriation for 1954 and the budget request for 1955:

Appropriation	1954 appropriations	1955 revised estimates	1955 bill
Assistance to States, general.....	\$10,135,000	\$14,386,500	\$9,725,000
Control of venereal diseases.....	1,976,500		700,000
Control of tuberculosis.....	4,275,000	2,000,000	4,275,000
Salaries, expenses, and grants, National Cancer Institute.....	2,250,000	2,250,000	2,250,000
Mental health activities.....	2,325,000	2,325,000	2,325,000
Salaries, expenses, and grants, National Heart Institute.....	1,125,000	1,125,000	1,125,000
Total.....	22,086,500	22,086,500	20,400,000

Venereal diseases.—The bill includes \$3,000,000, an increase of \$700,000 above the request, and a reduction of \$2,000,000 below the amount appropriated for 1954. The relationship of the budget requests for this item and the appropriation for Assistance to States, general, is explained above. The \$700,000 increase is for grants to states. The committee is of the opinion that these diseases are not a sufficient problem in most states to warrant federal grants-in-aid, and will therefore expect that the \$700,000 will be granted only for special projects in those areas where the problem is the most serious.

Tuberculosis.—The bill includes \$6,000,000, an increase of \$2,500,000 above the budget and the same as the amount appropriated for 1954. The relationship of the budget requests for this item and the appropriation for Assistance to States, general, is discussed above under the latter heading.

Communicable diseases.—The bill includes \$4,300,000, a reduction of \$97,000 from the request, and \$700,000 from the amount appropriated for 1954.

Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene.—The bill includes \$3,295,000, the amount of the request, and \$132,500 above the amount appropriated for 1954. The committee has included a provision in the bill to set aside \$270,000 of the amount provided, to complete the research center building at Cincinnati. At the present time, the fourth floor is unfinished and being used only for storage space, which, to the committee, seems utterly ridiculous. The committee has serious doubts that the Industrial Hygiene unit, rather than the applicable Institute, should be doing research in such things as mental health, cancer, hearing loss, etc. However, it is leaving to the Public Health Service the determination as to what internal adjustments should be made in this budget in order to provide the funds for the completion of the Cincinnati building.

It is hoped that more faith can be put in the testimony presented this year, regarding the consolidation of personnel and activities in the research center building, than could be put in it on the basis of the testimony of a year ago.

Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Territory of Alaska.—The bill includes \$1,125,000, an increase of \$63,000 above the request, and \$43,000 above the amount appropriated for 1954. The bill also includes language which will require that \$160,000 of the amount provided be used only for the operation of two marine health units that have been immobilized at Seattle for over two years. From the testimony of both the Public Health Service witnesses and the Commissioner of Health of the Territory, the operation of these mobile units is of great importance to the people of Alaska. The committee has added \$63,000 to the request, which will provide part of the funds needed for this activity, and will expect the Department to take, from less worthy projects under this appropriation, sufficient funds to make up the difference. This should not be difficult. The committee is far from convinced that there is a pressing need for some of the research, such as that on hibernating animals, that has recently been carried on with these funds.

Grants for hospital construction.—The bill includes \$65,000,000, a reduction of \$10,000,000 from the request and the same as the amount appropriated for 1954. The Congress now has before it proposed legislation which would authorize appropriations totaling \$180,000,000

over a three year period for construction of special types of hospitals and related facilities. In view of this, the Department included only \$50,000,000 in the budget transmitted to Congress in January. Then, on May 11, a supplemental request of \$25,000,000 was transmitted. The only reason that the Department was able to give for this 50 percent increase was that Congress was so slow in acting on their proposed new legislation that they were not going to be able to use the first year's \$60,000,000, and the supplemental was to replace what they wouldn't be able to spend on the new program. To the committee, this sounded more like an excuse than a reason. In the absence of an emergency, Congress seldom acts hurriedly on such an important legislative proposal as the extensive amendments proposed by the Department to the Hospital Construction Act. The committee does not believe that those at the head of the Department are so naive as to think otherwise. There was absolutely no testimony given the committee to indicate that a greater need, for federal hospital construction funds for this program, exists now than existed a year ago when the Congress provided \$65,000,000.

Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services.—The bill includes \$750,000, the full amount of the request, and a reduction of \$125,000 from the amount appropriated for 1954. The committee made no reduction in the request, in view of the fact that some increased workload will result in the \$15,000,000 increase in grant funds, above the amount budgeted for grants at the time the salaries and expenses budget was prepared.

Hospitals and medical care.—The bill includes \$33,000,000, a reduction of \$40,000 from the request, and \$100,000 from the amount appropriated for 1954.

Foreign quarantine service.—The bill includes \$2,900,000, the full amount of the request and the same as the amount appropriated for 1954.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

The bill includes \$73,393,000, an increase of \$2,265,000 above the request, and \$2,240,000 above the amount appropriated for 1954. The following table sets forth the committee's recommendations compared with the request and the appropriations for 1954:

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1954	Estimates, 1955	Recommended in bill for 1955	Bill compared with—	
				1954 appropriation	1955 estimates
Operating expenses.....	\$4,675,000	\$4,675,000	\$4,675,000	-----	-----
National Cancer Institute.....	20,237,000	19,730,000	20,237,000	-----	+\$507,000
Mental health activities.....	12,095,000	12,460,000	12,460,000	+\$365,000	-----
National Heart Institute.....	15,168,000	14,570,000	15,168,000	-----	+\$598,000
Dental health activities.....	1,740,000	1,730,000	1,740,000	-----	+10,000
Arthritis and metabolic disease activities..	7,000,000	7,270,000	7,270,000	+270,000	-----
Microbiology activities.....	5,738,000	5,930,000	5,930,000	+192,000	-----
Neurology and blindness activities.....	4,500,000	4,763,000	5,913,000	+1,413,000	+1,150,000
Total, National Institutes of Health..	71,153,000	71,128,000	73,393,000	+2,240,000	+2,265,000

As can be seen from the above table, the increases above the budget estimates, recommended by the committee are, with one exception, to restore cuts. The committee would be the first to recommend reductions in these funds, or the elimination of federal appropriations

for these programs, if it were shown that we can now prevent or cure these diseases, or that the incidence of these diseases is substantially declining. In all the voluminous testimony received by the committee, there was no indication that any of these things has happened. It was demonstrated that advances have been made in gaining a much better understanding of the problems involved, which should provide a basis for greater advances in finding preventatives and cures for these dread diseases. To start cutting back, right at the time when the prospect for really great discoveries is the brightest, seems very shortsighted.

A concrete example of what really great discoveries may be in the offing has apparently been produced by the Neurology and Blindness Institute. The committee was told by Dr. Bailey, Director of that Institute, of the discovery of a substance called glutamine, which has been used with such success in the treatment of ten very serious cases of epilepsy, that he believes it to have more promise for effectiveness than did streptomycin for the treatment of tuberculosis and ACTH and cortisone for the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis. It was stated to the committee, by one authority in this field, that if this one discovery proved as effective as preliminary tests indicate it to be, it will, just from a financial point of view, be worth more to the nation than the entire cost of all of the National Institutes since their beginning. Dr. Bailey estimated that it would require a minimum of \$1,000,000 to complete tests and to pave the way for commercial production of this product. The committee, therefore, has included \$750,000 more than the budget request to cover a portion of this cost, and will expect the Institute to provide, from the base appropriation, any reasonable additional amounts needed.

The committee has also included an additional \$400,000 above the amount requested for the Neurology and Blindness Institute to initiate a research program on blindness. The committee was very surprised to learn that the Clinical Center program for blindness is, to quote the Director, "a sort of a standby program." This problem is certainly important enough to warrant much more than a standby program at the Clinical Center.

The National Institutes of Health predoctorate fellowship program was transferred, in the 1954 budget, to the National Science Foundation. This was accomplished by a transfer, in the President's budget, of \$390,000 from the NIH. This amount of money was intended to provide approximately 200 predoctorate fellowships. The committee was advised that, as a result of this shift, approximately 140 fewer such fellowships were granted than would have been granted had the program remained in NIH. The committee is quite disturbed about this precipitous decline in so vital a program and desires that the NIH use funds provided in the bill, to reinstitute this program in 1955 on a scale which will make up the loss that has occurred. The committee further desires that in 1956 the part of this program remaining in the National Science Foundation be returned to the National Institutes of Health.

Gorgas Memorial Laboratory.—The bill includes \$131,000, the full amount of the request, and a reduction of \$12,000 from the amount appropriated for 1954.

Retired pay of commissioned officers.—The bill includes \$1,141,000, the full amount of the budget request, and \$56,000 less than the amount appropriated for 1954.

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$2,780,000, the full amount of the budget request, and \$120,000 less than the amount appropriated for 1954.

ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$2,445,000, the full amount of budget request, and \$28,000 above the amount appropriated for 1954.

Major repairs and preservation of building and grounds.—The bill includes \$709,000, the full amount of the request, and \$309,500 above the amount appropriated for 1954. The committee has not included language suggested in the budget for the purpose of requiring that the District of Columbia bear a proportion of the costs of capital outlay based on the percentage of District of Columbia patients to the total patient load. The committee still is strongly of the opinion that some such arrangement should be provided for, but understands that, after further study, it was found that the budget proposal was not practical and that a substitute proposal has been devised. The committee is therefore deferring action until proper consideration can be given the new proposal.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-age and Survivors Insurance.—The bill includes \$64,150,000, a reduction of \$1,000,000 from the request, and an increase of \$404,000 above the amount authorized for 1954. This is an authorization to use funds from the Old-age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, not an appropriation from the general funds of the Treasury.

Grants to States for public assistance.—The bill includes \$1,200,000, 000, the full amount of the request, and \$198,000,000 less than the amount appropriated for 1954. The amount required is determined by mathematical formulas set forth in the enabling legislation. Since these funds are subject to practically no administrative control, the committee has simply approved the best estimates of the experts in this field.

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance.—The bill includes \$1,450,000, a reduction of \$100,000 from the request and from the amount appropriated for 1954.

Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau.—The bill includes \$1,525,000, the full amount of the request and the same as the amount appropriated for 1954.

Grants to States for maternal and child welfare.—The bill includes \$30,000,000, the full amount of the request and the same as the amount appropriated for 1954. The committee has not included language which would establish the amount to go to each segment of this program, because it believes that if a formula for the division of these funds is needed, it should be provided in the enabling legislation.

Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner.—The bill includes \$296,500, of which \$123,500 would be provided by transfer from the Old-age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund. This is no change from the amounts requested, which are the same as the amounts provided for 1954.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary.—The bill includes \$1,246,000, of which \$171,000 would be derived from the Old-age and

Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, a reduction of \$75,000, in total amount, from the request and also from the amount provided in 1954.

Last year the Secretary asked for wide authority to transfer funds between appropriations and to transfer additional activities and funds from the Department's constituent agencies to the Secretary's office via the Secretary's "Working capital fund." The Congress denied these requests. Last year the committee stated in its report:

The committee was somewhat disappointed in the new Secretary when she requested all of such authority sought by her predecessor and in addition requested the committee to give her general authority to transfer up to 5 percent between any appropriations made to the Department. The committee is not disposed to relinquish the Congressional prerogative of determining the amount of funds to be spent for a given activity and the agency which is to spend such funds.

The committee is again denying the requested authority and emphatically reasserts the thoughts expressed in last year's report. The committee is sorry to state, however, that last year's language was not entirely effective. To cite one instance, even in the face of the above language, the Secretary used other authority to assess the various appropriations made to other parts of the Department, to finance the establishment and maintenance of a "chart room" in her office, at a cost of over \$100,000. There was no request made to this committee for such funds, nor did the Congress appropriate funds for this purpose. Since the committee is unable to state its position more clearly than was done in last year's report and since that has proven ineffective, language has been included in this year's bill to limit to \$200,000 the amount that may be transferred to this office from other appropriations to the Department. It is the intention of the committee that the 1956 bill will include a limitation prohibiting any such transfers. It is, therefore, recommended that the 1956 budget be so drawn as to reflect all anticipated expenditures of this office within the direct appropriations (including the authorization for direct transfer from the O. A. S. I. Trust Fund) requested for this office.

The committee is concerned not only with the fact that its action on this appropriation is negated by these transfers, but, what is basically more important, the fact that there seems to be a growing tendency to centralize more and more of the Department's administrative operations. The committee would not be averse to a certain amount of centralization for the sake of efficiency and economy; in fact, it has in the past taken action to bring such centralization about. During the hearings, however, the committee sought in vain for any economies in administration. Instead, it found that the administrative expenses estimated for 1954 are actually higher than for 1953, taken either as a percentage of total dollar costs or as a percentage of total personnel. No evidence was presented to indicate any reduction under the program for 1955. The committee is opposed to centralization simply for its own sake. The dividing line between program operations and administrative operations is hard to define, and is subject to wide shifts on the basis of a revision of definitions. The Congress has carefully guarded a degree of independence for the Public Health Service and the Office of Education not enjoyed by most departmental constituents. The committee would not want this independence jeopardized through overcentralization and there-

fore desires to review these proposals carefully before the fact. This will be assured by having the Secretary's Office financed entirely by appropriations made direct to that office through the usual budgetary processes.

Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Services.—The bill includes a total of \$2,125,000, a reduction of \$185,000 from the request, and \$85,000 from the amount appropriated for 1954. A provision has been included in the bill to provide not less than \$850,000 for the Grant-in-aid Audit Division. This is an increase of \$125,000 for that Division, whose very important work of auditing the expenditure of billions of federal dollars is now far from current and steadily falling further behind. The value of these audits is very greatly diminished as a result of their being delayed, in some cases two years or more after the expenditures being audited. In the opinion of the committee, the reduction provided for the "field services" activities under this appropriation can be absorbed at no detriment to the Department's programs.

It was quite evident from the hearings that the methods used in handling exceptions, by the Federal auditors, to payments to state agencies is cumbersome, time consuming and very inefficient. The committee strongly recommends that the present procedures be reviewed, by others than the program people, with the thought in mind that audit exceptions be handled directly from the state level to the headquarters in Washington and if not resolved between the Grant-in-Aid Audits Division and the constituent involved, be referred directly to the Office of the Secretary.

Salaries and expenses, Office of the General Counsel.—The bill includes a total of \$737,500, a reduction of \$50,000 from the request and the same as the amount appropriated for 1954.

Surplus property disposal.—The bill includes \$400,000, a reduction of \$50,000 from the request, and an increase of \$145,000 above the appropriation for 1954. All of the increase is provided for compliance work which, on the basis of past experience, will return several dollars to the Federal Treasury for each dollar of expenditures.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$8,400,000, a reduction of \$300,000 from the request, and \$725,000 from the appropriation for 1954.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$422,000, a reduction of \$14,000 from the request, and \$7,000 from the appropriation for 1954.

Arbitration and emergency boards.—The bill includes \$300,000, a reduction of \$30,000 from the request, and an increase of \$37,000 above the appropriation for 1954; however, considering the transfer in 1954 of \$85,000 from the President's emergency fund, the amount recommended is \$48,000 less than the amount available in 1954.

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$495,000, the full amount of the request, and \$2,000 less than the amount appropriated for 1954.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$6,108,000, the full amount of the request, and a reduction of \$99,000 from the authorization for 1954. This is an authorization for the use of funds from the Railroad Retirement Trust Fund, rather than an appropriation of funds from the Treasury.

FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$3,000,000, a reduction of \$170,000 from the request, and \$200,000 from the appropriation for 1954.

Boards of inquiry.—The bill includes \$10,000, the full amount of the request and the same as the amount appropriated for 1954.

LIMITATIONS AND LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

The following limitations and legislative provisions not heretofore carried in connection with any appropriation bill are recommended:

On page 2 in connection with "Office of the Secretary, salaries and expenses", Department of Labor:

of which not more than \$60,000 shall be for international labor affairs.

On page 20 in connection with "Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene", Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:

of which not less than \$270,000 shall be available only for completing construction of the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center, Cincinnati, Ohio.

On page 21 in connection with "Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Territory of Alaska", Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:

of which not less than \$160,000 shall be available only for the activation and operation of the two immobilized marine health units "Health" and "Hygiene".

On page 29 in connection with "Office of the Secretary, salaries and expenses", Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:

Provided, That not more than \$200,000 additional may be transferred to this head from other appropriations.

On page 29 in connection with "Office of the Secretary, Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Services", Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:}]

including not less than \$850,000 for the Division of Grant-in-Aid Audits,

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XIII, CLAUSE 2 (A)

The following is submitted in compliance with clause 2 (A), of rule XIII:

PENDING BILL

EXISTING LAW

On page 16, lines 17, 18, 19 and 20 in connection with "Office of Education, assistance for school construction", Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Public Law 357, 83d Congress, in connection with "Office of Education, assistance for school construction", Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:

Provided further, that the sum of \$125,000 made available for "technical services rendered by other agencies" under this head in Public Law 357, 83d Congress, shall remain available through June 30, 1955.

* * * including not to exceed \$125,000 for necessary expenses of technical services rendered by other agencies, \$55,000,000, to remain available until April 1, 1955:

PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS, GENERAL AND SPECIAL FUNDS

Agency and item	Appropriated, 1954	Estimates, 1955	Increase (+), decrease (—)
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE			
Office of Education:			
Payments to States and Territories for colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts (act of Mar. 4, 1907) -----	\$2, 550, 000	\$2, 550, 000	-----
Payments to States for promotion of vocational education (act of Feb. 23, 1917) -----	7, 138, 331	7, 138, 331	-----
Total, Office of Education -----	9, 688, 331	9, 688, 331	-----
Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare -----	9, 688, 331	9, 688, 331	-----
RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD			
Railroad retirement account (military service credits) -----	34, 852, 000	-----	—\$34, 852, 000
Total permanent appropriations, all agencies -----	44, 540, 331	9, 688, 331	—34, 852, 000

TRUST FUNDS

[Not a charge against general revenue]

Agency and item	Appropriated, 1954	Estimates, 1955	Increase (+), decrease (—)
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR			
Bureau of Employees' Compensation:			
Relief and rehabilitation, Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended -----	\$40, 000	\$40, 000	-----

Relief and rehabilitation, Workmen's Compensation Act, within the District of Columbia-----	5, 000	5, 000	-----
Bureau of Labor Statistics: Special statistical work-----	71, 500	9, 500	-\$62, 000
Total, Department of Labor-----	116, 500	54, 500	- 62, 000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE			
Freedmen's Hospital conditional gift fund-----	627	-----	- 627
Public Health Service:			
Patients' benefit fund, Public Health Service hospitals-----	1, 000	1, 000	-----
Public Health Service conditional gift fund-----	47, 900	24, 650	- 23, 250
Public Health Service unconditional gift fund-----	28, 500	27, 500	- 1, 000
St. Elizabeths Hospital patients' benefit fund-----	100	100	-----
Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare-----	78, 127	53, 250	- 24, 877
RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD			
Railroad retirement account-----	772, 452, 000	744, 900, 000	- 27, 552, 000
Railroad Unemployment Insurance Administration Fund-----	10, 000, 000	10, 000, 000	-----
Total, Railroad Retirement Board-----	782, 452, 000	754, 900, 000	- 27, 552, 000
Total trust funds, all agencies-----	782, 646, 627	755, 007, 750	- 27, 638, 877

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1954, ESTIMATES FOR 1955, AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1955**

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1954	Estimates, 1955	Recommended in bill for 1955	Bill compared with—	
				1954 appropriation	1955 estimates
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY					
Salaries and expenses-----	\$1, 350, 000	\$1, 355, 000	\$1, 300, 000	—\$50, 000	—\$55, 000
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR					
Salaries and expenses-----	1, 475, 000	1, 482, 000	1, 450, 000	—25, 000	—32, 000
BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS					
Salaries and expenses-----	700, 000	770, 000	655, 000	—45, 000	—115, 000
BUREAU OF VETERANS' REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS					
Salaries and expenses-----	300, 000	300, 000	300, 000	-----	-----
BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP					
Salaries and expenses-----	3, 230, 000	3, 215, 000	3, 100, 000	—130, 000	—115, 000
BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY					
Salaries and expenses-----	5, 300, 000	4, 760, 000	4, 650, 000	—650, 000	—110, 000
Grants to States-----	204, 305, 000	216, 400, 000	216, 400, 000	+12, 095, 000	-----

Unemployment compensation for veterans-----	77,900,000	55,600,000	55,600,000	-22,300,000	-----
Mexican farm labor program-----	1,728,000	1,746,000	1,521,000	-207,000	-225,000
Total, Bureau of Employment Security-----	289,233,000	278,506,000	278,171,000	-11,062,000	-335,000
BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION					
Salaries and expenses-----	2,000,000	2,030,000	2,030,000	+30,000	-----
Employees' compensation fund (indefinite)-----	[40,300,000]	[41,000,000]	[41,000,000]	[+700,000]	-----
Total, Bureau of Employees' Compensation-----	2,000,000	2,030,000	2,030,000	+30,000	-----
BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS					
Salaries and expenses-----	5,345,000	5,396,000	5,350,000	+5,000	-46,000
WOMEN'S BUREAU					
Salaries and expenses-----	350,000	348,000	348,000	-2,000	-----
WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION					
Salaries and expenses-----	6,250,000	6,233,000	6,000,000	-250,000	-233,000
Total Title I, Department of Labor-----	310,233,000	299,635,000	298,704,000	-11,529,000	-931,000

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1954, estimates for 1955, and amounts recommended in the bill for 1955—Con.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1954	Estimates, 1955	Recommended in bill for 1955	Bill compared with—	
				1954 appropriation	1955 estimates
AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND					
Education of the blind-----	\$175, 000	\$175, 000	\$175, 000	-----	-----
COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF					
Salaries and expenses-----	410, 000	410, 000	410, 000	-----	-----
Construction of buildings-----	41, 000	240, 000	259, 000	+\$218, 000	+\$19, 000
Total, Columbia Institution for the Deaf	451, 000	650, 000	669, 000	+ 218, 000	+ 19, 000
FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION					
Salaries and expenses (general)-----	5, 200, 000	5, 200, 000	5, 100, 000	— 100, 000	— 100, 000
Salaries and expenses (certification and inspection services)-----	[1, 045, 000]	[1, 045, 000]	[1, 045, 000]	-----	-----
Total, Food and Drug Administration----	5, 200, 000	5, 200, 000	5, 100, 000	— 100, 000	— 100, 000
FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL					
Salaries and expenses-----	3, 104, 000	2, 880, 000	2, 880, 000	— 224, 000	-----
HOWARD UNIVERSITY					
Salaries and expenses-----	2, 535, 000	2, 520, 000	2, 720, 000	+ 185, 000	+ 200, 000

Construction of buildings-----	20, 000	4, 708, 000	4, 808, 000	+4, 788, 000	+100, 000
Liquidation of contract authority-----		250, 000	1, 150, 000	+1, 150, 000	+900, 000
Total, Howard University-----	2, 555, 000	7, 478, 000	8, 678, 000	+6, 123, 000	+1, 200, 000
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Promotion and further development of vocational education-----	18, 673, 261	¹ 18, 673, 261	18, 374, 511	-298, 750	-298, 750
Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts-----	2, 501, 500	2, 501, 500	2, 501, 500		
Salaries and expenses-----	2, 900, 000	² 3, 200, 000	2, 900, 000		-300, 000
Payments to school districts-----	72, 350, 000	58, 500, 000	55, 000, 000	-17, 350, 000	-3, 500, 000
School construction-----	55, 000, 000			-55, 000, 000	
Assistance for school construction-----	70, 000, 000	³ 74, 000, 000	70, 000, 000		-4, 000, 000
Total, Office of Education-----	221, 424, 761	156, 874, 761	148, 776, 011	-72, 648, 750	-8, 098, 750
OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION					
Payments to States-----	23, 000, 000	19, 175, 000	21, 000, 000	-2, 000, 000	+1, 825, 000
Salaries and expenses-----	655, 500	650, 000	620, 000	-35, 500	-30, 000
Total, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation-----	23, 655, 500	19, 825, 000	21, 620, 000	-2, 035, 500	+1, 795, 000

¹ Includes \$1,173,261 in H. Doc. 386.² Includes \$100,000 in H. Doc. 393.³ Includes \$34,000,000 in H. Doc. 393.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1954, estimates for 1955, and amounts recommended in the bill for 1955—Con.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1954	Estimates, 1955	Recommended in bill for 1955	Bill compared with—	
				1954 appropriation	1955 estimates
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE					
Assistance to States, general-----	\$13, 250, 000	⁴ \$17, 665, 500	\$13, 000, 000	—\$250, 000	—\$4, 665, 500
Venereal diseases-----	5, 000, 000	2, 300, 000	3, 000, 000	—2, 000, 000	+700, 000
Tuberculosis-----	6, 000, 000	3, 500, 000	6, 000, 000	-----	+2, 500, 000
Communicable diseases-----	5, 000, 000	4, 397, 000	4, 300, 000	—700, 000	—97, 000
Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene-----	3, 162, 500	3, 295, 000	3, 295, 000	+132, 500	-----
Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Territory of Alaska-----	1, 082, 000	1, 062, 000	1, 125, 000	+43, 000	+63, 000
Grants for hospital construction-----	65, 000, 000	⁵ 75, 000, 000	65, 000, 000	-----	—10, 000, 000
Grants for hospital construction (liquidation of contract authority)-----	19, 700, 000	-----	-----	—19, 700, 000	-----
Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services-----	875, 000	750, 000	750, 000	—125, 000	-----
Hospitals and medical care-----	33, 100, 000	33, 040, 000	33, 000, 000	—100, 000	—40, 000
Foreign quarantine service-----	2, 900, 000	2, 900, 000	2, 900, 000	-----	-----
National Institutes of Health:					
Operating expenses-----	4, 675, 000	4, 675, 000	4, 675, 000	-----	-----

National Cancer Institute-----	20,237,000	19,730,000	20,237,000	-----	+507,000
Mental health activities-----	12,095,000	12,460,000	12,460,000	+365,000	-----
National Heart Institute-----	15,168,000	14,570,000	15,168,000	-----	+598,000
Dental health activities-----	1,740,000	1,730,000	1,740,000	-----	+10,000
Arthritis and metabolic disease activities-----	7,000,000	7,270,000	7,270,000	+270,000	-----
Microbiology activities-----	5,738,000	5,930,000	5,930,000	+192,000	-----
Neurology and blindness activities-----	4,500,000	4,763,000	5,913,000	+1,413,000	+1,150,000
Subtotal, National Institutes of Health-----	71,153,000	71,128,000	73,393,000	+2,240,000	+2,265,000
Gorgas Memorial Laboratory-----	143,000	131,000	131,000	-12,000	-----
Retired pay of commissioned officers-----	1,197,000	1,141,000	1,141,000	-56,000	-----
Salaries and expenses-----	2,900,000	2,780,000	2,780,000	-120,000	-----
Construction of research facilities (liquidation of contract authorization)-----	2,500,000	-----	-----	-2,500,000	-----
Total, Public Health Service-----	232,962,500	219,089,500	209,815,000	-23,147,500	-9,274,500
ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL					
Salaries and expenses-----	2,417,000	2,445,000	2,445,000	+28,000	-----
Major repairs and preservation of buildings and grounds-----	399,500	709,000	709,000	+309,500	-----
Total, St. Elizabeths Hospital-----	2,816,500	3,154,000	3,154,000	+337,500	-----

⁴ Includes \$2,626,500 in H. Doc. 386.⁵ Includes \$25,000,000 in H. Doc. 386.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1954, estimates for 1955, and amounts recommended in the bill for 1955—Con.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1954	Estimates, 1955	Recommended in bill for 1955	Bill compared with—	
				1954 appropriation	1955 estimates
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION					
Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-age and Survivors Insurance-----	[\$63, 746, 000]	[\$65, 150, 000]	[\$64, 150, 000]	[+\$404, 000]	[- \$1, 000, 000]
Construction, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance-----	[1, 500, 000]	-----	-----	- [1, 500, 000]	-----
Grants to States for public assistance-----	1, 398, 000, 000	1, 200, 000, 000	1, 200, 000, 000	-198, 000, 000	-----
Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance-----	1, 550, 000	1, 550, 000	1, 450, 000	-100, 000	-100, 000
Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau-----	1, 525, 000	1, 525, 000	1, 525, 000	-----	-----
Grants to States for maternal and child welfare-----	30, 000, 000	30, 000, 000	30, 000, 000	-----	-----
Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner:-----					
Appropriation-----	173, 000	173, 000	173, 000	-----	-----
Transfer from OASI-----	[123, 500]	[123, 500]	[123, 500]	-----	-----
Operating fund, Bureau of Federal Credit Unions-----	250, 000	-----	-----	-250, 000	-----
Total, Social Security Administration-----	1, 431, 498, 000	1, 233, 248, 000	1, 233, 148, 000	-198, 350, 000	-100, 000

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary:

Appropriation-----	1, 150, 000	1, 150, 000	1, 075, 000	-75, 000
Transfer from OASI-----	[171, 000]	[171, 000]	[171, 000]	-----

Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Services:

Appropriation-----	1, 835, 000	1, 935, 000	1, 775, 000	-160, 000
Transfer from OASI-----	[375, 000]	[375, 000]	[350, 000]	[-25, 000]

Salaries and expenses, Office of the General Counsel:

Appropriation-----	350, 000	400, 000	350, 000	-50, 000
Transfer from OASI-----	[365, 000]	[365, 000]	[365, 000]	-----

Transfer from "Salaries and expenses, certification and inspection services"

	[22, 500]	[22, 500]	[22, 500]	-----
--	-----------	-----------	-----------	-------

Surplus property disposal-----

	255, 000	450, 000	400, 000	+145, 000
--	----------	----------	----------	-----------

Total, Office of the Secretary-----	3, 590, 000	3, 935, 000	3, 600, 000	+10, 000
				-335, 000

Total Title II, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare-----

	1, 927, 432, 261	1, 652, 509, 261	1, 637, 615, 011	-289, 817, 250
--	------------------	------------------	------------------	----------------

				-14, 894, 250
--	--	--	--	---------------

TITLE III--NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Salaries and expenses-----	\$9, 125, 000	\$8, 700, 000	\$8, 400, 000	-\$725, 000
----------------------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	-------------

				-\$300, 000
--	--	--	--	-------------

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1954, estimates for 1955, and amounts recommended in the bill for 1955—Con.

TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1954	Estimates, 1955	Recommended in bill for 1955	Bill compared with—	
				1954 appropriation	1955 estimates
Salaries and expenses-----	\$429, 000	\$436, 000	\$422, 000	—\$7, 000	—\$14, 000
Arbitration and emergency boards-----	263, 000	330, 000	300, 000	+37, 000	—30, 000
National Railroad Adjustment Board, salaries and expenses-----	497, 000	495, 000	495, 000	—2, 000	-----
Total, National Mediation Board-----	1, 189, 000	1, 261, 000	1, 217, 000	+28, 000	—44, 000

TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Salaries and expenses (trust fund limitation)-----	[\$6, 207, 000]	[\$6, 108, 000]	[\$6, 108, 000]	[—\$99, 000]	-----
--	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	--------------	-------

TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

Salaries and expenses-----	\$3, 200, 000	\$3, 170, 000	\$3, 000, 000	—\$200, 000	—\$170, 000
Boards of inquiry-----	10, 000	10, 000	10, 000	-----	-----
Total, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service-----	3, 210, 000	3, 180, 000	3, 010, 000	—200, 000	—170, 000
Grand total, all titles of bill-----	2, 251, 189, 261	1, 965, 285, 261	1, 948, 946, 011	—302, 243, 250	—16, 339, 250

Union Calendar No. 635

83^D CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 9447

[Report No. 1756]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 4, 1954

Mr. BUSBEY, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the following bill; which was committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

A BILL

Making appropriations for the Department of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Depart-
5 ments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and

1 related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending
2 June 30, 1955, namely:

3 TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

4 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

5 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
6 Office of the Secretary of Labor (hereafter in this title
7 referred to as the Secretary), including services as authorized
8 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a);
9 teletype news service; and payment in advance when
10 authorized by the Secretary for dues or fees for library
11 membership in organizations whose publications are avail-
12 able to members only or to members at a price lower than
13 to the general public; \$1,300,000, of which not more than
14 \$60,000 shall be for international labor affairs.

15 OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

16 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
17 Office of the Solicitor, \$1,450,000.

18 BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS

19 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
20 promotion of industrial safety, employment stabilization, and
21 amicable industrial relations for labor and industry; perform-
22 ance of safety functions of the Secretary under the Federal
23 Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (5 U. S. C. 784
24 (c)); performance of the functions vested in the Secretary
25 by title I of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29

1 U. S. C. 159 (f) and (g)) ; and not to exceed \$70,000 for
2 the work of the President's Committee on National Employ
3 the Physically Handicapped Week, as authorized by the
4 Act of July 11, 1949 (63 Stat. 409), including purchase
5 of reports and of material for informational exhibits and
6 expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants
7 at conferences concerned with the work of the Bureau of
8 Labor Standards; \$655,000.

9 BUREAU OF VETERANS' REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS

10 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to
11 render assistance in connection with the exercise of re-
12 employment rights under section 8 of the Selective Training
13 and Service Act of 1940, as amended (50 U. S. C. App.
14 308), the Service Extension Act of 1941, as amended, the
15 Army Reserve and Retired Personnel Service Law of 1940,
16 as amended, and section 9 of the Universal Military Train-
17 ing and Service Act, and, under the Act of June 23, 1943,
18 as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 1472), of persons who have
19 performed service in the Merchant Marine, \$300,000.

20 BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP

21 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to en-
22 able the Secretary to conduct a program of encouraging
23 apprentice training as authorized by the Act of August 16,
24 1937 (29 U. S. C. 50), \$3,100,000.

1 BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

2 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
3 general administration of the employment service and unem-
4 ployment compensation programs, including temporary em-
5 ployment of persons, without regard to the civil-service laws,
6 for the farm placement migratory labor program; and not
7 to exceed \$10,000 for services as authorized by section 15
8 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; \$4,650,000,
9 of which \$1,100,000 shall be for carrying into effect the
10 provisions of title IV (except section 602) of the Service-
11 men's Readjustment Act of 1944.

12 Grants to States for unemployment compensation and
13 employment service administration: For grants in accord-
14 ance with the provisions of the Act of June 6, 1933, as
15 amended (29 U. S. C. 49-49n), for carrying into effect
16 section 602 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944,
17 for grants to the States as authorized in title III of the Social
18 Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 501-503), including,
19 upon the request of any State, the purchase of equipment,
20 and the payment of rental for space made available to
21 such State in lieu of grants for such purpose, for nec-
22 essary expenses in connection with the operation of em-
23 ployment office facilities and services in the District of
24 Columbia, and for expenses not otherwise provided for,
25 necessary for carrying out title IV of the Veterans' Readjust-

1 ment Assistance Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 684), \$216,-
2 400,000, of which \$16,400,000 shall be available only
3 to the extent that the Secretary finds necessary to meet
4 increased costs of administration resulting from changes
5 in a State law or increases in the numbers of claims
6 filed and claims paid over those upon which the State's
7 basic grant (or the allocation for the District of Columbia)
8 was based, which increased costs of administration cannot
9 be provided for by normal budgetary adjustments: *Provided*,
10 That notwithstanding any provision to the contrary in section
11 302 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended, the Secre-
12 tary of Labor shall from time to time certify to the Secretary
13 of the Treasury for payment to each State found to be in
14 compliance with the requirements of the Act of June 6, 1933,
15 and, except in the case of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands,
16 with the provisions of section 303 of the Social Security Act,
17 as amended, such amounts as he determines to be necessary
18 for the proper and efficient administration of its unemploy-
19 ment compensation law and of its public employment offices:
20 *Provided further*, That such amounts as may be agreed upon
21 by the Department of Labor and the Post Office Department
22 shall be used for the payment, in such manner as said parties
23 may jointly determine, of postage for the transmission of
24 official mail matter in connection with the administration of

1 unemployment compensation systems and employment serv-
2 ices by States receiving grants herefrom.

3 In carrying out the provisions of said Act of June 6,
4 1933, the provisions of section 303 (a) (1) of the Social
5 Security Act, as amended, relating to the establishment and
6 maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, shall
7 apply.

8 None of the funds appropriated by this title to the
9 Bureau of Employment Security for grants-in-aid of State
10 agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of operation
11 of said agencies including the salaries and expenses of officers
12 and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld from the
13 said agencies of any States which have established by legis-
14 lative enactment and have in operation a merit system and
15 classification and compensation plan covering the selection,
16 tenure in office, and compensation of their employees, be-
17 cause of any disapproval of their personnel or the manner
18 of their selection by the agencies of the said States, or the
19 rates of pay of said officers or employees.

20 Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For mak-
21 ing, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to
22 States under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended,
23 and under the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended, for the first
24 quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may
25 be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures

1 made thereunder for payments under such title and under
2 such Act of June 6, 1933, to be charged to the appropriation
3 therefor for that fiscal year.

4 Unemployment compensation for veterans: For pay-
5 ments to unemployed veterans as authorized by title IV of
6 the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952,
7 \$55,600,000.

8 Unemployment compensation for veterans, next succeed-
9 ing fiscal year: For making, after May 31 of the current
10 fiscal year, payments to States, as authorized by title IV
11 of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, such
12 sums as may be necessary to pay benefits for the first quarter
13 of the next succeeding fiscal year, and the obligations and
14 expenditures thereunder shall be charged to the appropria-
15 tion therefor for that fiscal year.

16 Salaries and expenses, Mexican farm labor program:
17 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to
18 carry out the functions of the Department of Labor under
19 the Act of July 12, 1951 (Public Law 78), as amended,
20 including temporary employment of persons without regard
21 to the civil service laws, \$1,521,000.

22 BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION

23 Salaries and expenses: For necessary administrative
24 expenses and not to exceed \$112,000 for the Employees'
25 Compensation Appeals Board, \$2,030,000, together with

1 not to exceed \$90,000 to be derived from the War Claims
2 Fund created by section 13 (a) of the War Claims Act
3 of 1948 (50 U. S. C. 2012).

4 Employees' compensation fund: For the payment of
5 compensation and other benefits and expenses (except ad-
6 ministrative expenses) authorized by law and accruing dur-
7 ing the current or any prior fiscal year, including payments
8 to other Federal agencies for medical and hospital services
9 pursuant to agreement approved by the Bureau of Employ-
10 ees' Compensation; continuation of payment of benefits as
11 provided for under the head "Civilian War Benefits" in the
12 Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1947; the
13 advancement of costs for enforcement of recoveries in third-
14 party cases; the furnishing of medical and hospital services
15 and supplies, treatment, and funeral and burial expenses,
16 including transportation and other expenses incidental to
17 such services, treatment, and burial, for such enrollees of the
18 Civilian Conservation Corps as were certified by the Director
19 of such Corps as receiving hospital services and treatment
20 at Government expense on June 30, 1943, and who are
21 not otherwise entitled thereto as civilian employees of the
22 United States, and the limitations and authority of the Act
23 of September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U. S. C. 796), shall
24 apply in providing such services, treatment, and expenses in
25 such cases; such amount as may be required during the

1 current fiscal year: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall
2 be available for payments pursuant to sections 4 (c) and
3 5 (f) of the War Claims Act of 1948 (50 U. S. C. 2012)
4 and shall be credited with advances or reimbursements there-
5 for from the War Claims Fund created by section 13 (a)
6 of said War Claims Act of 1948.

7 BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

8 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
9 work of the Bureau, including advances or reimbursement
10 to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees
11 for services rendered, and not to exceed \$15,000 for serv-
12 ices as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,
13 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$5,350,000.

14 WOMEN'S BUREAU

15 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
16 work of the Women's Bureau, as authorized by the Act of
17 June 5, 1920 (29 U. S. C. 11-16), including purchase of
18 reports and material for informational exhibits, \$348,000.

19 WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

20 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for per-
21 forming the duties imposed by the Fair Labor Standards
22 Act of 1938, as amended, and the Act to provide conditions
23 for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by
24 the United States, approved June 30, 1936, as amended

1 (41 U. S. C. 35-45), including reimbursement to State,
2 Federal, and local agencies and their employees for inspec-
3 tion services rendered, and not to exceed \$3,000 for ex-
4 penses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants
5 at conferences concerned with the work of the Division,
6 \$6,000,000.

7 GENERAL PROVISIONS

8 SEC. 102. Appropriations under this title available for
9 salaries and expenses shall be available for stenographic
10 reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
11 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and for expenses of
12 attendance at meetings concerned with the function or activ-
13 ity for which any such appropriation is made.

14 This title may be cited as the "Department of Labor
15 Appropriation Act, 1955".

16 TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCA-
17 TION, AND WELFARE

18 AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

19 Education of the blind: For carrying out the Act of
20 August 4, 1919, as amended (20 U. S. C. 101), \$175,000.

21 COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF

22 Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of Co-
23 lumbia Institution for the Deaf, including personal services
24 and miscellaneous expenses, and repairs and improvements,
25 \$410,000: *Provided*, That the Columbia Institution for the

1 Deaf shall be paid by the District of Columbia, in advance
2 at the beginning of each quarter, at the rate of \$1,295 per
3 school year for each student attending said Institution
4 pursuant to the Act of March 1, 1901 (31 D. C. Code
5 1008).

6 Construction: For the construction of a library-class-
7 room building at the Columbia Institution for the Deaf,
8 \$240,000, to remain available until expended; and for
9 alterations, \$19,000; in all, \$259,000.

10 FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

11 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses for
12 carrying out the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act,
13 as amended (21 U. S. C. 301-392); the Tea Importation
14 Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 41-50); the Import Milk
15 Act (21 U. S. C. 141-149); the Federal Caustic Poison
16 Act (15 U. S. C. 401-411); and the Filled Milk Act, as
17 amended (21 U. S. C. 61-64); reporting and illustrating
18 the results of investigations; purchase of chemicals, appa-
19 ratus, and scientific equipment; not to exceed \$2,000 for
20 payment in advance for special tests and analyses by con-
21 tract; and payment of fees, travel, and per diem in connection
22 with studies of new developments pertinent to food and drug
23 enforcement operations; \$5,100,000.

24 Salaries and expenses, certification and inspection serv-
25 ices: For expenses necessary for the certification or in-

1 spection of certain products in accordance with sections
2 406, 504, 506, 507, 604, 702A, and 706 of the Federal
3 Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 346,
4 354, 356, 357, 364, 372a, and 376), the aggregate of
5 the advance deposits during the current fiscal year to cover
6 payment of fees by applicants for certification or inspection
7 of such products, to remain available until expended. The
8 total amount herein appropriated shall be available for
9 personal services; purchase of chemicals, apparatus, and
10 scientific equipment; and the refund of advance deposits
11 for which no service has been rendered.

12 FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL

13 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for opera-
14 tion and maintenance, including repairs; furnishing, repair-
15 ing, and cleaning of wearing apparel used by employees in
16 the performance of their official duties; transfer of funds to
17 the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Howard Univer-
18 sity" for salaries of technical and professional personnel de-
19 tailed to the hospital; payments to the appropriation of
20 Howard University for actual cost of heat, light, and
21 power furnished by such university; \$2,880,000: *Pro-*
22 *vided*, That no intern or resident physician receiving
23 compensation from this appropriation on a full-time basis
24 shall receive compensation in the form of wages or salary
25 from any other appropriation in this title: *Provided further*,

1 That the District of Columbia shall pay by check to Freed-
2 men's Hospital, upon the Surgeon General's request, in ad-
3 vance at the beginning of each quarter, such amount as the
4 Surgeon General calculates will be earned on the basis of
5 rates approved by the Bureau of the Budget for the care
6 of patients certified by the District of Columbia. Bills ren-
7 dered by the Surgeon General on the basis of such calcula-
8 tions shall not be subject to audit or certification in advance
9 of payment; but proper adjustment of amounts which have
10 been paid in advance on the basis of such calculations shall
11 be made at the end of each quarter: *Provided further*, That
12 the Surgeon General may delegate the responsibilities im-
13 posed upon him by the foregoing proviso.

14 HOWARD UNIVERSITY

15 Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of How-
16 ard University, including personal services and miscellaneous
17 expenses and repairs to buildings and grounds, \$2,720,000.

18 Construction of buildings: For the construction and
19 equipment of buildings and facilities, under the supervision
20 of the General Services Administration, on the grounds of
21 Howard University, including engineering and architectural
22 services and travel, to remain available until expended, as
23 follows:

24 For a preclinical medical building, together with altera-

1 tions and installations in connection with such construction,
2 \$4,436,000.

3 For a power substation, together with necessary altera-
4 tions within the power plant, \$272,000.

5 For repairs to the power plant, \$100,000.

6 Construction of buildings (liquidation of contract au-
7 thorization): For payment of obligations incurred under
8 authority previously provided, to enter into contracts for the
9 construction of the following: Biology-greenhouse building,
10 \$250,000; law building, \$200,000; and administration build-
11 ing, \$700,000.

12 OFFICE OF EDUCATION

13 Promotion and further development of vocational educa-
14 tion: For carrying out the provisions of section 3 of the
15 Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20 U. S. C. 15),
16 section 4 of the Act of March 10, 1924 (20 U. S. C. 29),
17 section 1 of the Act of March 3, 1931 (20 U. S. C. 30),
18 and the Act of March 18, 1950 (Public Law 462),
19 \$18,374,511: *Provided*, That the apportionment to the
20 States under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 shall
21 be computed on the basis of not to exceed \$18,199,511 for
22 the current fiscal year: *Provided further*, That not more
23 than \$450,000 of this appropriation shall be available for
24 vocational education in distributive occupations.

25 Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and the

1 mechanic arts: For carrying out the provisions of section
2 22 of the Act of June 29, 1935, as amended, \$2,501,500.

3 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
4 Office of Education, including surveys, studies, investiga-
5 tions, and reports regarding libraries; fostering coordina-
6 tion of public and school library service; coordination of
7 library service on the national level with other forms of
8 adult education; developing library participation in Federal
9 projects; fostering Nation-wide coordination of research
10 materials among libraries, interstate library coordination and
11 the development of library service throughout the country;
12 purchase, distribution, and exchange of educational docu-
13 ments, motion-picture films, and lantern slides; collection,
14 exchange, and cataloging of educational apparatus and appli-
15 ances, articles of school furniture and models of school build-
16 ings illustrative of foreign and domestic systems and methods
17 of education, and repairing the same; \$2,900,000, of which
18 not less than \$480,000 shall be available for the Division
19 of Vocational Education as authorized: *Provided*, That all
20 receipts from non-Federal agencies representing reimburse-
21 ment for expenses of travel of employees of the Office of
22 Education performing advisory functions to the said agencies
23 shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to
24 the credit of this appropriation.

25 Payments to school districts: For payments to local

1 educational agencies for the maintenance and operation of
2 schools as authorized by the Act of September 30, 1950
3 (Public Law 874), as amended, \$55,000,000: *Provided*,
4 That this appropriation shall also be available for carrying
5 out the provisions of section 6 of such Act.

6 Assistance for school construction: For an additional
7 amount for providing school facilities and for grants to local
8 educational agencies in federally affected areas, as author-
9 ized by titles III and IV of the Act of September 23, 1950
10 (Public Law 815), as amended, including not to exceed
11 \$575,000 for necessary expenses of technical services ren-
12 dered by other agencies, \$70,000,000, to remain available
13 until expended, and of which \$12,000,000 shall be available
14 for carrying out title IV of said Act: *Provided*, That no part
15 of this appropriation shall be available for salaries or other
16 direct expenses of the Department of Health, Education,
17 and Welfare: *Provided further*, That the sum of \$125,000
18 made available for "technical services rendered by other
19 agencies" under this head in Public Law 357, 83d Congress,
20 shall remain available through June 30, 1955.

21 OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

22 Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and
23 Puerto Rico): For payments to States (including Alaska,
24 Hawaii, and Puerto Rico) in accordance with the Vocational
25 Rehabilitation Act, as amended (29 U. S. C., ch. 4) in-

cluding payments, in accordance with regulations of the Secretary, for one-half of necessary expenditures for the acquisition of vending stands or other equipment in accordance with section 3 (a) (3) (C) of said Act for the use of blind persons, such stands or other equipment to be controlled by the State agency, \$21,000,000, of which not to exceed \$160,000 shall be available to the Secretary for providing rehabilitation services to disabled residents of the District of Columbia, as authorized by section 6 of said Act, which latter amount shall be available for administrative expenses in connection with providing such services in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That not to exceed 15 per centum of the appropriation shall be used for administrative purposes: *Provided further*, That the funds herein appropriated shall be apportioned among the States in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary to insure equitable maintenance and improvement of State programs; and the obligation of the United States to any State under such Act for the current fiscal year shall not exceed the amount so apportioned to such State.

Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico), next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after May 31, of the current fiscal year, payments to States in accordance with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as

1 amended (including the objects specified in the preceding
2 paragraph), for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal
3 year such sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred
4 and the expenditures made thereunder to be charged to the
5 appropriation therefor for that fiscal year: *Provided*, That
6 the payments made pursuant to this paragraph shall not
7 exceed the amount paid to the States for the first quarter of
8 the current fiscal year.

9 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary in carry-
10 ing out the provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act,
11 as amended, and of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (20
12 U. S. C., ch. 6A), including not to exceed \$3,000 for pro-
13 duction, purchase, and distribution of educational films;
14 \$620,000.

15 PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

16 For necessary expenses in carrying out the Public Health
17 Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 6A) (herein-
18 after referred to as the Act), and other Acts, including
19 expenses for active commissioned officers in the Reserve
20 Corps and for not to exceed one thousand five hundred com-
21 missioned officers in the Regular Corps, as follows:

22 Assistance to States, general: To carry out the pur-
23 poses, not otherwise specifically provided for, of section 314
24 (c) of the Act; to provide consultative services to States
25 pursuant to section 311 of the Act; to make field investiga-

1 tions and demonstrations pursuant to section 301 of the
2 Act; to provide for collecting and compiling mortality,
3 morbidity, and vital statistics; and not to exceed \$1,000
4 for entertainment of officials of other countries when specifi-
5 cally authorized by the Surgeon General; \$13,000,000, of
6 which not more than \$2,400,000 shall be available for
7 personal services.

8 Venereal diseases: To carry out the purposes of sections
9 314 (a) and 363 of the Act with respect to venereal diseases
10 including the operation and maintenance of centers for the
11 diagnosis and treatment of persons afflicted with venereal
12 diseases; and for grants of money, services, supplies, equip-
13 ment, and use of facilities to States, as defined in the Act,
14 and with the approval of the respective State health author-
15 ities, to counties, health districts, and other political sub-
16 divisions of the States, for the foregoing purposes, in such
17 amounts and upon such terms and conditions as the Surgeon
18 General may determine; \$3,000,000.

19 Tuberculosis: To carry out the purposes of section 314
20 (b) of the Act, \$6,000,000.

21 Communicable diseases: To carry out, except as other-
22 wise provided for, those provisions of sections 301, 311, and
23 361 of the Act relating to the prevention and suppression
24 of communicable and preventable diseases, and the inter-
25 state transmission and spread thereof, including the purchase,

1 erection, and maintenance of portable buildings; and hire,
2 maintenance, and operation of aircraft; \$4,300,000.

3 Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene: For
4 expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary to carry out
5 those provisions of sections 301, 311, 314 (c), and 361 of
6 the Act relating to sanitation and other aspects of environ-
7 mental health, including enforcement of applicable quaran-
8 tine laws and interstate quarantine regulations, and for carry-
9 ing out the purposes of the Water Pollution Control Act (33
10 U. S. C. 466-466 (j)) ; \$3,295,000, of which not less than
11 \$270,000 shall be available only for completing construction
12 of the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center, Cincin-
13 nati, Ohio.

14 Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Ter-
15 ritory of Alaska: To enable the Surgeon General to conduct,
16 in the Service, and to cooperate with and assist the Territory
17 of Alaska in the conduct of, activities necessary in the
18 investigation, prevention, treatment, and control of diseases,
19 and the establishment and maintenance of health and sani-
20 tation services pursuant to and for the purposes specified in
21 sections 301, 311, 314 (without regard to the provisions of
22 subsections (d), (f), (h), and (j) and the limitations set
23 forth in subsection (c) of such section), 361 and 363 of the
24 Act, including the hire, operation, and maintenance of air-

craft, and the purchase, erection, and maintenance of portable buildings, \$1,125,000, of which not less than \$160,000 shall be available only for the activation and operation of the two immobilized marine health units "Health" and "Hygiene".

Grants for hospital construction: For payments for hospital construction under part C, title VI, of the Act, as amended, to remain available until expended, \$65,000,000: *Provided*, That allotments under such part C to the several States for the current fiscal year shall be made on the basis of an amount equal to the appropriation granted herein.

Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services: For salaries and expenses incident to carrying out title VI of the Act, as amended, \$750,000.

Hospitals and medical care: For carrying out the functions of the Public Health Service under the Act of August 8, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 150), and under sections 321, 322, 324, 326, 331, 332, 341, 343, 344, 502, 504, and 710 of the Public Health Service Act, and Executive Order 9079 of February 26, 1942, including purchase and exchange of farm products and livestock; conducting research on technical nursing standards and furnishing consultative nursing services; and purchase of firearms and ammunition; \$33,000,000, of which \$1,000,000 shall be exclusively available for payments to the Territory of Hawaii for care

1 and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy: *Provided*,
2 That when the Public Health Service establishes or operates
3 a health service program for any department or agency,
4 payment for the estimated cost shall be made in advance for
5 deposit to the credit of this appropriation.

6 Foreign quarantine service: For carrying out the pur-
7 poses of sections 361 to 369 of the Act, relating to prevent-
8 ing the introduction of communicable diseases from foreign
9 countries, the medical examination of aliens in accordance
10 with section 325 of the Act, and the care and treatment of
11 quarantine detainees pursuant to section 322 (e) of the
12 Act in private or other public hospitals when facilities of
13 the Public Health Service are not available, including in-
14 surance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when
15 required by law of such countries; \$2,900,000.

16 National Institutes of Health, operating expenses: For
17 the activities of the National Institutes of Health, not other-
18 wise provided for, including research fellowships and grants
19 for research projects pursuant to section 301 of the Act; not
20 to exceed \$1,000 for entertainment of visiting scientists when
21 specifically approved by the Surgeon General; erection of
22 temporary structures; and grants of therapeutic and chemical
23 substances for demonstrations and research; \$4,675,000:
24 *Provided*, That the Surgeon General is authorized to advance
25 to this appropriation from other appropriations to the Public

1 Health Service such amounts as are determined to be neces-
2 sary for the foregoing purposes and for activities performed
3 on a centralized basis: *Provided further*, That the Surgeon
4 General is authorized to operate facilities at the National
5 Institutes of Health for the sale of meals to employees and
6 others at rates determined by him to be sufficient to recover
7 the cost of such operation and the proceeds thereof shall be
8 credited to this appropriation.

9 National Cancer Institute: To enable the Surgeon Gen-
10 eral, upon the recommendations of the National Advisory
11 Cancer Council, to make grants-in-aid for research and train-
12 ing projects relating to cancer; to cooperate with State health
13 agencies, and other public and private nonprofit institutions,
14 in the prevention, control, and eradication of cancer by
15 providing consultative services, demonstrations, and grants-
16 in-aid; and to otherwise carry out the provisions of title IV,
17 part A, of the Act; \$20,237,000.

18 Mental health activities: For expenses necessary for
19 carrying out the provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 311,
20 312, and 314 (c) of the Act with respect to mental diseases,
21 \$12,460,000.

22 National Heart Institute: For expenses necessary to
23 carry out the purposes of the National Heart Act,
24 \$15,168,000.

25 Dental health activities: For expenses not otherwise

1 provided for, necessary to enable the Surgeon General to
2 carry out the purposes of the Act with respect to dental
3 diseases and conditions, \$1,740,000.

4 Arthritis and metabolic disease activities: For expenses
5 necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act relating to
6 arthritis, rheumatism, and metabolic diseases, \$7,270,000.

7 Microbiology activities: For expenses necessary to carry
8 out the purposes of the Act relating to microbiology, in-
9 cluding the regulation and preparation of biologic products,
10 \$5,930,000.

11 Neurology and blindness activities: For expenses nec-
12 essary to carry out the purposes of the Act relating to
13 neurology and blindness, \$5,913,000.

14 Gorgas Memorial Laboratory: For payment to the
15 Gorgas Memorial Institute for maintenance and operation
16 of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, \$131,000.

17 Retired pay of commissioned officers: For retired pay
18 of commissioned officers, as authorized by law, and payments
19 under the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of
20 1953, \$1,141,000.

21 Salaries and expenses: For the divisions and offices of
22 the Office of the Surgeon General and for miscellaneous
23 expenses of the Public Health Service not appropriated for
24 elsewhere, including preparing information, articles, and

1 publications related to public health; and conducting studies
2 and demonstrations in public health methods; \$2,780,000.

3 Administrative provisions: During the current fiscal
4 year, and with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget,
5 there may be transferred from any annual appropriation
6 to the Public Health Service to any other such appropria-
7 tion such additional amounts as may be required for pay
8 and allowances of the active commissioned officers herein
9 authorized, but any amounts so transferred shall not exceed
10 5 per centum of any such appropriation and no such appro-
11 priation shall be increased by more than 5 per centum as a
12 result of any such transfers.

13 SAINT ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

14 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
15 maintenance and operation of the hospital, including pur-
16 chase of clothing for patients and cooperation with organiza-
17 tions or individuals in the scientific research into the nature,
18 causes, prevention and treatment of mental illness, \$2,445,-
19 000.

20 Major repairs and preservation of buildings and
21 grounds: For miscellaneous construction, alterations, repairs,
22 and equipment, on the grounds of the hospital, including
23 preparation of plans and specifications, advertising, and
24 supervision of construction, \$709,000: *Provided*, That any

1 part of this amount may be transferred to the General
2 Services Administration.

3 SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

4 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors
5 Insurance: For necessary expenses, including furnishing,
6 repairing, and cleaning of wearing apparel and equipment
7 used by building guards; not more than \$64,150,000 may
8 be expended from the Federal old-age and survivors insur-
9 ance trust fund.

10 Grants to States for public assistance: For grants to
11 States for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid
12 to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled,
13 as authorized in titles I, IV, X, and XIV of the Social
14 Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subchs. I, IV,
15 X, and XIV) , \$1,200,000,000, of which such amount as may
16 be necessary shall be available for grants for any period in
17 the prior fiscal year subsequent to March 31 of that year.

18 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance: For
19 expenses necessary for the Bureau of Public Assistance,
20 \$1,450,000.

21 Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau: For necessary
22 expenses in carrying out the Act of April 9, 1912, as
23 amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 6), and title V of the Social
24 Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V),
25 including purchase of reports and material for the publica-

1 tions of the Children's Bureau and of reprints for distribution,
2 \$1,525,000: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation
3 contained in this title shall be used to promulgate or carry
4 out any instructions, order, or regulation relating to the care
5 of obstetrical cases which discriminate between persons
6 licensed under State law to practice obstetrics: *Provided*
7 *further*, That the foregoing proviso shall not be so construed
8 as to prevent any patient from having the services of any
9 practitioner of her own choice, paid for out of this fund, so
10 long as State laws are complied with: *Provided further*,
11 That any State plan which provides standards for professional
12 obstetrical services in accordance with the laws of the State
13 shall be approved.

14 Grants to States for maternal and child welfare: For
15 grants to States for maternal and child-health services, serv-
16 ices for crippled children, and child-welfare services as
17 authorized in title V, parts 1, 2, and 3, of the Social Security
18 Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V), \$30,000,-
19 000: *Provided*, That any allotment to a State pursuant to
20 section 502 (b) or 512 (b) of such Act shall not be included
21 in computing for the purposes of subsections (a) and (b) of
22 sections 504 and 514 of such Act an amount expended or
23 estimated to be expended by the State.

24 Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner: For
25 expenses necessary for the Office of the Commissioner of

1 Social Security, \$173,000, together with not to exceed
2 \$123,500 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and
3 survivors insurance trust fund.

4 Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For mak-
5 ing, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to
6 States under titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV, respectively, of
7 the Social Security Act, as amended, for the first quarter of
8 the next succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may be neces-
9 sary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures made
10 thereunder for payments under each of such titles to be
11 charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year.

12 In the administration of titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV,
13 respectively, of the Social Security Act, as amended, pay-
14 ments to a State under any of such titles for any quarter
15 in the period beginning April 1 of the prior year, and ending
16 June 30 of the current year, may be made with respect to a
17 State plan approved under such title prior to or during such
18 period, but no such payment shall be made with respect to
19 any plan for any quarter prior to the quarter in which such
20 plan was submitted for approval.

21 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

22 Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary: For
23 expenses necessary for the Office of the Secretary, \$1,075,-
24 000, together with not to exceed \$171,000 to be transferred
25 from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund:

1 *Provided*, That not more than \$200,000 additional may be
2 transferred to this head from other appropriations.

3 Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Services: For
4 expenses necessary for the Office of Field Services,
5 including not less than \$850,000 for the Division of Grant-
6 in-Aid Audits, \$1,775,000, together with not to exceed
7 \$350,000 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and
8 survivors insurance trust fund.

9 Salaries and expenses, Office of the General Counsel: For
10 expenses necessary for the Office of the General Counsel,
11 \$350,000, together with not to exceed \$22,500 to be trans-
12 ferred from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, certifi-
13 cation and inspection services", and not to exceed \$365,000
14 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors in-
15 surance trust fund.

16 Surplus property disposal: For expenses necessary for
17 carrying out the provisions of subsections 203 (j) and (k)
18 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act
19 of 1949, as amended, relating to disposal of real and personal
20 excess property for educational purposes and protection of
21 public health, \$400,000.

22 GENERAL PROVISIONS

23 SEC. 202. Appropriations under this title available for
24 salaries and expenses shall be available for payment in
25 advance for dues or fees for library membership in organiza-

1 tions whose publications are available to members only or to
2 members at a price lower than to the general public.

3 SEC. 203. Appropriations under this title available for
4 salaries and expenses shall be available for services as
5 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5
6 U. S. C. 55a).

7 SEC. 204. Appropriations under this title available for
8 salaries and expenses shall be available for travel expenses
9 and not to exceed \$75,000 of such funds shall be avail-
10 able for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with
11 the functions or activities for which such appropriations are
12 made.

13 SEC. 205. None of the funds appropriated by this title
14 to the Social Security Administration for grants in aid of
15 State agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of
16 operation of said agencies including the salaries and expenses
17 of officers and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld
18 from the said agencies of any States which have established
19 by legislative enactment and have in operation a merit sys-
20 tem and classification and compensation plan covering the
21 selection, tenure in office, and compensation of their em-
22 ployees, because of any disapproval of their personnel or
23 the manner of their selection by the agencies of the said
24 States, or the rates of pay of said officers or employees.

25 SEC. 206. The Secretary is authorized to make such

1 transfers of motor vehicles, between bureaus and offices,
2 without transfer of funds, as may be required in carrying
3 out the operations of the Department.

4 This title may be cited as the "Department of Health,
5 Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1955".

6 TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

7 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
8 National Labor Relations Board to carry out the functions
9 vested in it by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947
10 (29 U. S. C. 141-167), and other laws, including expenses
11 of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the
12 Board when specifically authorized by the Chairman or the
13 General Counsel; and services as authorized by section
14 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a);
15 \$8,400,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation
16 shall be available to organize or assist in organizing agricul-
17 tural laborers or used in connection with investigations, hear-
18 ings, directives, or orders concerning bargaining units com-
19 posed of agricultural laborers as referred to in section 2 (3)
20 of the Act of July 5, 1935 (49 Stat. 450), and as amended
21 by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and as
22 defined in section 3 (f) of the Act of June 25, 1938 (52
23 Stat. 1060), and including in said definition employees
24 engaged in the maintenance and operation of ditches, canals,
25 reservoirs, and waterways when maintained or operated on

1 a mutual, nonprofit basis and at least 95 per centum of the
2 water stored or supplied thereby is used for farming pur-
3 poses.

4 This title may be cited as the "National Labor
5 Relations Board Appropriation Act, 1955".

6 TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

7 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
8 National Mediation Board, including stenographic reporting
9 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August
10 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$422,000.

11 Arbitration and emergency boards: For expenses neces-
12 sary for arbitration boards established under section 7 of
13 the Railway Labor Act, as amended (45 U. S. C. 157),
14 and emergency boards appointed by the President pursuant
15 to section 10 of said Act (45 U. S. C. 160), including
16 stenographic reporting services as authorized by section 15
17 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$300,000.

18 NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

19 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
20 National Railroad Adjustment Board, including stenographic
21 reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
22 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$495,000, of which not
23 less than \$175,000 shall be available for compensation (at
24 rates not in excess of \$75 per diem) and expenses of referees

1 appointed pursuant to section 3 of the Railway Labor Act,
2 as amended.

3 This title may be cited as the “National Mediation
4 Board Appropriation Act, 1955”.

5 TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

6 Salaries and expenses, Railroad Retirement Board (trust
7 fund) : For expenses necessary for the Railroad Retirement
8 Board, including not to exceed \$1,000 for expenses of attend-
9 ance at meetings concerned with the work of the Board, when
10 specifically authorized by the Board; and stenographic re-
11 porting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
12 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; \$6,108,000, to be derived
13 from the railroad retirement account.

14 This title may be cited as the “Railroad Retirement Board
15 Appropriation Act, 1955”.

16 TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND 17 CONCILIATION SERVICE

18 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
19 Service to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-
20 Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 171–180,
21 182), including expenses of the Labor-Management Panel
22 as provided in section 205 of said Act; temporary employ-
23 ment of arbitrators, conciliators, and mediators on labor
24 relations at rates not in excess of \$75 per diem; expenses of

1 attendance at meetings concerned with labor and industrial
2 relations; and services as authorized by section 15 of the
3 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; \$3,000,000.

4 Boards of inquiry: To enable the Service to pay neces-
5 sary expenses of boards of inquiry appointed by the President
6 pursuant to section 206 of the Labor-Management Relations
7 Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 176–180, 182), including services
8 as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
9 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and rent in the District of Columbia,
10 \$10,000.

11 This title may be cited as the “Federal Mediation and
12 Conciliation Service Appropriation Act, 1955”.

13 TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

14 SEC. 701. No part of any appropriation contained in this
15 Act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person
16 who engages in a strike against the Government of the
17 United States or who is a member of an organization of Gov-
18 ernment employees that asserts the right to strike against
19 the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or
20 is a member of an organization that advocates, the over-
21 throw of the Government of the United States by force or
22 violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit
23 shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person
24 making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this
25 section engaged in a strike against the Government of the

1 United States, is not a member of an organization of Gov-
2 ernment employees that asserts the right to strike against
3 the Government of the United States, or that such person
4 does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization
5 that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the
6 United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That
7 any person who engages in a strike against the Government
8 of the United States, or who is a member of an organization
9 of Government employees that asserts the right to strike
10 against the Government of the United States, or who advo-
11 cates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates,
12 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by
13 force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages
14 for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this
15 Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be
16 fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than
17 one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty
18 clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any
19 other provisions of existing law.

20 SEC. 702. No part of any appropriation contained in this
21 Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not
22 authorized by the Congress.

23 SEC. 703. No part of any appropriation contained in this
24 Act shall be used to pay compensation of any employee
25 engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that

1 would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one
2 hundred and five, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and
3 intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided,*
4 That for purposes of this section employees shall be con-
5 sidered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time
6 or more in personnel administration consisting of direction
7 and administration of the personnel program; employment,
8 placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification;
9 employee relations and services; training; committees of
10 expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage
11 administration; and processing, recording, and reporting.

12 This Act may be cited as the "Departments of Labor,
13 and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act,
14 1955."

A BILL

Making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BUSBY

JUNE 4, 1954

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued June 9, 1954
For actions of June 8, 1954
83rd-2nd, No. 105

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....4,10,28	Labor.....4	Price supports.....1,15,20
Commodity exchanges.....19	Lands, public.....6,12,13	Reclamation.....12,21,27
Dairy industry.....15	transfer.....7	Roads.....10
Education.....4,28	Legislative program.....19	Seeds.....5
Electrification.....17	Loans, farm.....8,9,19	Soil conservation.....9
Expenditures.....14	Marketing.....2	Surplus commodities.....1,31
Extension Service.....12	Meat inspection.....30	Tobacco.....2
Fisheries.....3	Minerals.....12,13	Trade, foreign,16,22,23,26
Food, distribution....1,31	Personnel.....14,18,29	Water compacts.....24
Forestry....5,6,7,10,11,25	Poultry.....30	Wool.....26

HIGHLIGHTS: House committee voted to continue 90% price supports and to report bill for disposal of surplus commodities to foreign countries. House passed amended version of bill to increase excess-tobacco penalty. House committee voted to report bill to transfer CCC seed to Forest Service, etc. House committee reported bill to earmark part of Sec. 32 funds for fishery products. House debated Labor-HEW appropriation bill. Rep. Patman criticized bill to authorize increase in interest on farm-tenant loans. Rep. Miller, Kans., spoke in favor of watershed bill and soil-conservation loans bill. House received appropriation estimate for forest roads and trails. Sen. Kefauver introduced and discussed bill to continue 90% price supports for 2 years. Rep. Byrd commended USDA for distribution of surplus commodities in W. Va. Senate committee ordered reported bill transferring Indian extension work to USDA, etc. Sens. Ferguson and Holland spoke in favor of flexible price supports. Sen. Gore and others recommended extension of Trade Agreements Act. Rep. Byrnes, Wis., introduced and discussed customs simplification bill.

HOUSE

1. PRICE SUPPORTS; SURPLUS COMMODITIES. The "Daily Digest" states: "Committee on Agriculture: Agreed to report to the House S. 2475, relative to sale and disposal of surplus agricultural commodities to foreign countries. The text of this Senate bill was replaced by language presently contained in the House committee print which has been under study by the committee... Voted (21 to 8) that the level of support to cooperators shall be 90 percent of the parity price of the 1955 crop of any basic commodity, with respect to which producers have not disapproved marketing quotas." (p. D647.)
2. TOBACCO QUOTAS. Vacated the previous passage of S. 3050, to increase the penalty on marketing tobacco in excess of quotas, and passed the bill again with an amendment by Rep. Deane, N. C., to make the bill effective July 1, 1955, instead of July 1, 1954 (p. 7413).
3. FISHERY PRODUCTS. The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee reported without amendment S. 2802, to earmark part of Sec. 32 funds for education, publicity, and research on fish and related products for a temporary period (H. Rept. 1770)(p. 7454).

- LABOR-NEW APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955. Began and concluded general debate on this bill, H. R. 9447 (pp. 7417-46). It is expected that the bill will be read for amendment beginning today. Rep. Marshall spoke in support of the vocational education item with respect to its application to agriculture (p. 7440).

Following are excerpts from the committee report:

Mexican farm labor program. "The bill includes \$1,521,000, a reduction of \$225,000 from the request, and \$207,000 from the amount appropriated for 1954. The amount approved is the full amount requested, except that no funds are included to cover the cost of medical examinations, estimated at \$225,000. After the budget was prepared, the Comptroller General ruled that these costs are legal charges against the revolving fund supported by fees charged the growers who use this labor."

Education. "Further endowment of Colleges of Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts.--The bill includes \$2,501,500, the full amount of the request and the same as the amount appropriated for 1954."

- CCC SEEDS; FORESTRY. The Banking and Currency Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 2987, to transfer certain surplus CCC seeds to the Forest Service and BLM for seeding (p. D647).
- FORESTRY. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee's public lands subcommittee voted to report to the full committee H. R. 1254, amended, to authorize long-term leases of Forest Service lands, etc. (p. D648).
- LAND TRANSFERS. Passed without amendment S. 1400, to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to release the reversionary rights of the U. S. in and to a tract of former FHA land in Wake County, N. C. (p. 7412). This bill will now be sent to the President.
Passed as reported H. R. 6263, to return to the Rotary Club of Ketchikan, Alaska, a tract of land which had been donated to the Forest Service by the Club (p. 7413).
- FARM LOANS. Rep. Patman criticized H. R. 8656, which would authorize the Department to permit increased interest rates on insured loans under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (pp. 7436-7).
- SOIL CONSERVATION; FARM LOANS. Rep. Miller, Kans., spoke in favor of his bill to authorize insured loans for soil-conservation expenses and the Hope-Aiken watershed bill (pp. 7451-3).

- 10. APPROPRIATIONS. Received from the President an omnibus submission of supplemental appropriation estimates; to Appropriations Committee (H. Doc. 428) (p. 7454). One of these items is \$16,000,000 for liquidation of obligations incurred for expenses and payment of contract earnings for forest roads and trails, pursuant to the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1954, of which \$9,500,000 would be derived by transfer from the 1955 appropriation for forest roads and trails.

SENATE

- 1. FORESTRY. Concurred in the House amendments to S. 1399, to authorize sale of certain improvements on national forest land in Arizona to the Salt River Valley Water Users Association (p. 7379). This bill will now be sent to the President.
- 2. EXTENSION SERVICE; MINERALS; RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs

(U. S. C., 1952 ed., title 5, sec. 16) will be sufficient.

Section 603 of the bill proposes to amend section 583 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C., 1952 ed., title 19, sec. 1583). Section 583 provides that the customs or Coast Guard officer's certification regarding the inspection of the manifest required by that section shall be made on "the back of" the original manifest. The manifest forms now in use have the space for such certification on the front. The procedural detail as to place of certification on a manifest is a minor one that should be left to administrative regulation, and it is proposed to delete the language "the back of" in that section.

TITLE VII—CUSTOMS ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 701 of the bill provides for the repeal of section 3062 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 ed., title 19, sec. 483), relating to forfeitures and penalties for aiding unlawful importation, and in lieu thereof proposes for insertion in the Tariff Act of 1930, where it more properly belongs, a revised provision which makes no important change in substance but more clearly expresses the intent.

Subsection (a) of section 3062 is aimed at the forfeiture of conveyances and equipment used in connection with the unlawful importation of merchandise, but its language is not entirely clear in that respect. Subsection (b) of Revised Statutes 3062 is limited in application to cases in which the value of the merchandise unlawfully introduced exceeds \$100. It is believed that this limitation should be removed so that cases involving petty smuggling may be settled administratively by the assessment of a penalty equal to the value of the goods rather than by criminal action, which is the only possible action under this subsection when the value of the merchandise is \$100 or less. It is believed that the criminal sanction should be eliminated, since it is a practical duplication of United States Code, title 18, sec. 545.

Section 702 would amend section 451 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 1451), which requires that, in all cases where a party in interest requests the service of customs officers or employees in connection with unloading at night, or on Sunday or a holiday, a bond shall be given to indemnify the United States for any loss or liability which may occur or be occasioned by reason of the granting of a special license to unlade and to pay the compensation of customs officers and employees assigned to duty in connection with the unloading. The sole condition of the form of bond used in connection with requests for overtime services is that the principal shall pay promptly on demand the compensation and expense of customs officers and employees assigned to such overtime services pursuant to the request. The proposed amendment would permit the deposit of sufficient money to cover the costs of such service in lieu of the filing of the bond. The same provision is also made with respect to other night, Sunday, and holiday services requested under this section. It is believed that the proposed amendment will improve public relations and permit the simplification of customs procedures while, at the same time, it will provide adequate control over the collection of overtime compensation and expenses.

Section 703 of the bill relates to section 581 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 1581), which contains authority for the boarding of vessels and vehicles. Subsection (a) of section 581 provides that under the circumstances therein described a customs officer may "hail and stop such vessel or vehicle and use all necessary force to compel compliance"; and sub-

section (d) provides a penalty against the master in the event that a vessel fails to come to a stop and makes it the duty of customs officers to pursue such vessels. The proposed amendment to section 581 (d) would provide a penalty against the owner, operator, or person in charge of the vessel as well as the master. It is believed that such a penalty is an essential enforcement measure. The proposed amendment would also delete the provision for pursuit as unnecessary.

Section 704 of the bill would amend section 605 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C., 1952 ed., title 19, sec. 1605) which provides that seized property shall be stored in the customs collection district where it is seized, and shall remain in the judicial district of seizure in order that the district court may have jurisdiction when condemnation proceedings are instituted. *The Ann* ((1815) 9 Cranch (13 U. S.) 288); *The Rio Grande* ((1874) 23 Wall. (90 U. S.) 458.) The amendment to section 605 proposed by section 704 of the bill would permit the Secretary to store such seized property in such places as he considers more convenient and appropriate, whether or not within the judicial district in which the property was seized. The amendment further provides that the storage of the property outside the judicial district in which it was seized shall in no way affect the jurisdiction of the court over such property.

There are occasions when there are no facilities or places to store and maintain seized property in the judicial district of seizure, but the Customs Service or the Government has storage facilities in an adjacent judicial district where the seizures may be adequately and economically stored and safeguarded pending forfeiture and disposition thereof. As a customs collection district may include only a part of a State in which there are several judicial districts, or a collection district may cover a number of States, it is sometimes desirable to store seized property at the nearest customhouse or Government facility in the same collection district which may be in another judicial district or in an adjacent customs district which may be in another State.

Section 705 of the bill would amend sections 607, 610, and 612 of the tariff act (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, secs. 1607, 1610, and 1612) so as to permit summary forfeiture and disposition of seized property valued at not in excess of \$2,500. Under existing law, summary forfeiture is permitted in cases involving not in excess of \$1,000. It is believed that the increase from \$1,000 to \$2,500 is appropriate because of the change in the value of the dollar since the tariff act was enacted.

Section 706 would amend section 545 of title 18 of the United States Code under which smuggled merchandise may be forfeited to the United States. Under that section the Government may not recover the value of goods illegally introduced into the commerce of the country (*National Atlas Elevator Company v. United States* (CCA 8th, 1938), 97 Fed. 2d 940). The amendment proposed by section 706 of the bill would permit the forfeiture of the value of merchandise imported contrary to law to be recovered from persons involved or implicated therein when such merchandise is not available for seizure.

HOSPITALIZATION OF CERTAIN VETERANS IN THE PHILIPPINES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 8044) to extend the authorization

for funds for the hospitalization of certain veterans in the Philippines, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That section 4 of Public Law 865, 80th Congress, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 4. Grants for expenses incident to hospitalization may be made for a period not to exceed 10 years to reimburse the Republic of the Philippines for moneys expended for such hospitalization: *Provided*, That the total of such grants for any 1 calendar year shall not exceed the following amounts: For any year prior to 1955, \$3,285,000; for 1955, \$3,000,000; for 1956, \$2,500,000; for 1957, \$2,000,000; for 1958, \$1,500,000; and for 1959 \$1,000,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9447) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 4 hours, the time to be equally controlled by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9447, with Mr. NICHOLSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, the requests of the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and related independent agencies totaled \$1,965,285,261, a decrease of \$285,904,000 from the amount appropriated for the fiscal year 1954. The committee has reduced the total of the requests by \$16,339,250, and

recommends a total appropriation of \$1,948,946,011, which is \$302,243,250 less than the amount appropriated for 1954.

Mr. Chairman, under permission previously granted in the House, I desire to

insert at this point a table from page 2 of our committee report that shows similar information for each the the Departments and related independent agencies:

Department or agency	Appropriations, 1954	Budget estimates, 1955	Bill for 1955	Bill for 1955 compared with—	
				Appropriations, 1954	Budget estimates, 1955
Department of Labor.....	\$310, 233, 000	\$299, 635, 000	\$298, 704, 000	—\$11, 529, 000	—\$931, 000
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.....	1, 927, 432, 261	1, 652, 509, 261	1, 637, 615, 011	—289, 817, 250	—14, 894, 250
National Labor Relations Board.....	9, 125, 000	8, 700, 000	8, 400, 000	—725, 000	—300, 000
National Mediation Board.....	1, 189, 000	1, 261, 000	1, 217, 000	+28, 000	—44, 000
Railroad Retirement Board.....	[6, 207, 000]	[6, 108, 000]	[6, 108, 000]	[—99, 000]	-----
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....	3, 210, 000	3, 180, 000	3, 010, 000	—200, 000	—170, 000
Total.....	2, 251, 189, 261	1, 965, 285, 261	1, 948, 946, 011	—302, 243, 250	—16, 339, 250

In the Department of Labor, salaries and expenses for the Office of the Secretary, the bill includes \$1,300,000, a reduction of \$55,000 from the request and \$50,000 from the appropriation for 1954. The only reduction of consequence in that particular office was taken in the Office of International Labor Affairs.

If you will refer to the hearings, you will see that we explored this situation rather thoroughly, and the committee thought this cut was very fully justified.

In speaking of the Department of Labor, I think it is well to call to the attention of the committee that, last year, there were many crocodile tears shed over what were reported to be drastic cuts in salary and expense items for the Department of Labor; but, strange as it may seem, when the Department of Labor came in this year with their budget requests for appropriations, they were almost identical with what was allowed the Department of Labor last year by the Congress.

For the Bureau of Labor Standards, salaries and expenses, the committee has recommended \$655,000, a reduction of \$115,000 from the request and \$45,000 from the appropriation for 1954. Of the \$115,000 reduction, \$100,000 is accounted for in the request for additional Federal personnel to handle the problems of migrant labor. Last year they requested \$185,000 for the same project, and this year they reduced it \$85,000 and asked for \$100,000.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Did the gentleman give due consideration to the fact that the extensive unemployment throughout the country has increased the demand for appropriations in this field, to handle migratory labor?

Mr. BUSBEY. There was no testimony before the committee to that effect.

Mr. BAILEY. The situation would be quite different if we had full employment. We have considerable unemployment and the question is of getting the people from places where there are no jobs to places where there are jobs. It occurs to me that this is one item that could not well be cut.

Mr. BUSBEY. I appreciate the thought of the gentleman from West Virginia, but this problem pertains mainly to the migrant labor in the agricultural fields—the farm labor that moves from State to State, following the harvesting season from the South to the North.

Mr. BAILEY. Not necessarily. It would apply to any migratory labor, would it not?

Mr. BUSBEY. The testimony was that this program was for the migratory farm laborers. I will say to the gentleman from West Virginia that this problem of migrant labor is being handled at the present time by the Children's Bureau; the Bureau of Labor Standards; the Office of Education; the Department of Agriculture; the Bureau of Employment Security through their grants to States; and the Wage and Hour Division has its nose under the tent to some extent. Also, the Public Health Service is doing work on the problems of migrant labor.

About 2 weeks ago, Mrs. Hobby, the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, opened what I believe was known as the East Coast Conference on migrant labor.

So, I believe there should be a determination at a high level concerning who is going to handle the problems of the migrant laborers. As it is now, every agency is trying to get into the show.

Mr. BAILEY. If the gentleman will yield further, may I ask, is it not true that this has been traditionally an activity of the Department of Labor and that the participation of the other bureaus in this problem has been more recent?

Mr. BUSBEY. I do not know of any testimony to that effect. The Department of Agriculture, I think, has participated in this activity for the last several years.

Mr. BAILEY. Is any part of the funds in this item that has to do with migratory labor devoted to the Mexican wet-back labor problem?

Mr. BUSBEY. No; this has nothing whatever to do with the Mexican farm-labor program.

Mr. BAILEY. This is an internal problem?

Mr. BUSBEY. This is an internal problem, concerned with our own mi-

grant labor here in the United States; that is correct.

On page 387 of the hearings, in the testimony of Dr. Eliot, the head of the Children's Bureau, we find:

Many States and localities are interested in their migrant problem and are willing to do their share, provided the communities from which the migrants come and to which they go will do theirs also. The Children's Bureau, working with the Office of Education and the Public Health Service, is proposing an east coast project, the core of which is help to the States along the east coast migratory stream to pool their plans and coordinate their services.

The first step in carrying out this proposal will be a meeting of the public and voluntary agencies from the various States involved. Such a meeting is planned for the spring of 1954 and is expected to provide an opportunity for cooperative interstate planning in health, education, and welfare for these migrant children.

The gentleman from West Virginia may be correct that the Department of Labor would be the proper department to handle this problem, but if they are going to handle it, let us not have all these other agencies handling it also.

I, as chairman of the committee, was swamped with communications from people in every State of the Nation, who wanted the \$100,000 in the bill. I desire to give a little bit of advice to whoever it was that inspired this pressure campaign. I resented the manner in which the pressure campaign was handled, because it was quite evident that the vast majority of the people who sent the letters knew nothing about the problem in any way, shape, manner, nor form. They were not familiar with the situation, but were sending those letters merely at the instigation of someone else. None of the letters gave any good reasons why the \$100,000 should be appropriated for this program.

Frankly, I am very happy to sit down, at any time, with any individual, or delegation from any organization, regardless of whom it may be, to discuss items that are in the appropriation bill handled by the subcommittee of which I am the chairman. I like to receive letters from people who have taken the time to study a problem, know something about it, and can give reasons for their requests, but I do not appreciate pressure mail. If they want to try it again, I will tell them in advance they had better save their postage.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico, a member of the committee.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I just want to say that the chairman is not the only one who received those hundreds and hundreds of letters from all over the United States. The other members of the committee did also, and I assume other Members of Congress. But I do want to say I did not resent any of them; in fact, I appreciated them, perhaps because I agree with them.

Mr. BUSBEY. The gentleman is, of course, entitled to his own opinion on pressure mail; as I am entitled to mine.

Let me speak briefly of the Bureau of Apprenticeship. There was a great deal of interest in that last year, as you may recall. This bill includes \$3,100,000, or a decrease of only \$115,000 from the amount requested, and \$130,000 from the appropriation for 1954.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I have scores of protests against a reduction in this particular item, and they are coming from Legion posts, posts of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and from at least three of the major labor groups. They say that this is a fine program, and they do not want it curtailed in any extent. The more forcible statements came from the Legion posts and from the Veterans of Foreign Wars who are participating in the training of veterans in this apprenticeship work. I do not know to what extent they pressured the chairman of the committee, but they certainly put the pressure on several Members of the Congress. I have scores of requests to pay particular attention to this item. Would the gentleman give us some reason as to why this cut was made?

Mr. BUSBEY. I would be very happy to. First of all, I wish to assure the gentleman I have not received pressure mail from anyone on this item. I agree with the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] 100 percent in his statement that it is a fine program. It is. I think the Bureau of Apprenticeship has been doing a very excellent job. The cut here recommended is so small percentage-wise that it will not jeopardize the splendid program in any way. I do not believe that the gentleman from West Virginia has as much confidence in the present administration as I have. I think many of these programs can be administered just as efficiently with a little less money. Somewhere along the line, we have to work a little harder to improve the efficiency of these Government operations.

Mr. BAILEY. I think that attitude is a very desirable one.

Mr. BUSBEY. I think, too, it is very desirable that the industries and labor unions and the States become a little more active in this program.

Mr. BAILEY. Does the gentleman remember how much this item was cut in the 1954 budget? It appears to me that there was a pretty heavy cut last year.

Mr. BUSBEY. Yes, I think it was a rather heavy cut—a few hundred thousand dollars, as I recall offhand, but I do not have the figures here before me.

Mr. BAILEY. That is one reason why I am protesting at this time that perhaps successive cuts of that kind may destroy the program or at least injure it.

Mr. BUSBEY. I would not have voted for this decrease if I thought for a minute that it would destroy the program.

As to the Bureau of Employment Security, there is recommended in the bill \$4,650,000 for salaries and expenses, a reduction of \$110,000 from the request, and \$650,000 from the appropriation for

1954. The amount recommended includes \$1,100,000 for the Veterans' Employment Service, which is the same amount appropriated for the year 1954, but \$400,000 above the amount recommended in the budget. It is the committee's opinion that the amount recommended is about the minimum necessary for an effective VES program. When the time comes that the program is not needed, it should be eliminated entirely; but to appropriate for the abbreviated and ineffective program proposed by the budget would have been a waste of funds. This program has been cut during the past few years from \$2,650,600 in 1947 down to \$1,100,000. In most of the States, the personnel is down to one man and a clerk. This is one program that the veterans' organizations throughout the country are very jealous of, and I concur in their position. I was a member of the Veterans' Legislative Committee in the 78th Congress that wrote this provision into the GI bill.

It was the one thing on which all veterans' organizations were united. With the Korean veterans coming back and the situation as it is, I think it is more important than ever that this program be continued. In the judgment of the committee \$1,100,000, which is the amount they had last year, is the minimum for an effective program.

For grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration, the bill includes \$216,400,000, the total amount requested, and an increase of \$12,095,000 above the amount appropriated for 1954. The amount allowed is composed of \$200 million as a base amount, and \$16,400,000 as a contingency fund. The base amount is equal to the total amount estimated to be expended in 1954, and is provided on the premise that the total workload of 1955 will be equal to the total workload of 1954.

In recognition of the uncertainties involved in predicting this workload, the committee is providing a contingency fund considerably larger than has been provided in past years. The committee has not allowed the requested authority to use the contingency fund to defray the costs of State salary increases. The language of the bill will provide for a continuation of the 1954 policy of requiring that any salary increases be absorbed.

For unemployment compensation for veterans, the bill includes \$55,600,000, the amount of the budget request. We have been informally advised that there is a supplemental request of a sizable amount in the process of being submitted by the Bureau of the Budget. This is one of those items in the bill, like so many others, which is specified by law, and which the committee and the Congress have no control over, unless the Congress wants to change the authorizing law. I have no doubt that the supplemental request will be adopted by the Congress.

The bill includes \$1,521,000 for the Mexican farm labor program, a reduction of \$225,000 from the request, and \$207,000 from the amount appropriated in 1954. The amount approved is the

full amount requested, except that no funds are included to cover the cost of medical examinations, estimated to be \$225,000. After the budget was prepared, the Comptroller General ruled that these costs are legal charges against the revolving fund, supported by fees charged the growers who use this labor; thus, there is no need to include funds for that purpose in this appropriation.

There is no change of any significance for the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Bureau of Labor Statistics, nor Women's Bureau.

For the Wage and Hour Division, the bill included \$6 million, a reduction of \$233,000 from the request and \$250,000 from the amount appropriated for 1954.

For the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, this bill includes \$1,637,615,011; a reduction of \$14,894,250 from the request and \$289,817,250 from the appropriations for 1954.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield.

Mr. CORBETT. I wish to make an inquiry. What effect will this reduction in the appropriation have on the number of investigators examining possible violations of wage-hour legislation?

Mr. BUSBEY. That, I think, is something like quoting an economist. You know, you can quote an economist, who is an outstanding authority, on one side of an economic question; then you can find an economist of equal reputation, who is on the other side. I am sure the gentleman could quote authorities on both sides as to what effect this would have on the number of investigations.

The Wage and Hour Division, I am glad to say, has made some real economies; they have worked out a simplification of their forms, and they have worked out a simplification of the method of reporting investigations. They are now working on further procedural changes which will result in economies. They are doing an excellent job along that line, and I think they can do a good job of enforcing these laws with the funds allowed.

Mr. CORBETT. Is it not correct that the figure approved by the subcommittee is approximately \$250,000 less than the amount approved last year and \$233,000 less than the budget request?

Mr. BUSBEY. Yes, that is right.

Mr. CORBETT. My point is this—and I am strictly still asking for information—is it not very likely true that the intent and purpose of Congress in passing these laws is in jeopardy when they do not have sufficient investigators to perhaps make sufficient spot checks on violations? Would not the ordinary industry that is complying with this law appreciate having their competitors required to comply also?

Mr. BUSBEY. Yes; I think the gentleman is right. That is like a candidate I knew who was running for office. His platform was that he was against sin and for pure drinking water. That is a foregone conclusion. But labor is organized today, and the representatives of labor unions are very vigilant in these matters. With the law becoming better known to the employers than it was be-

fore, I do not believe this reduction will hurt the program very much, even if they applied the whole cut to the investigators and none to their regional offices and to the Washington office. It would amount to only about 40 investigators out of several hundred, if the whole cut were applied to this group of employees.

Mr. CORBETT. That is the point of information. I am not quarreling with the gentleman as of today. The gentleman did use the figures, perhaps the one I am most interested in is your estimate that there would be a reduction of only 40 investigators.

Mr. BUSBEY. Yes, that is my estimate.

Mr. CORBETT. What would that do based on your figures? You started out in the paragraph by saying you did not know and then ended up by saying that it would be about 40 out of a thousand.

Mr. BUSBEY. What do you mean?

Mr. CORBETT. How much of a reduction would result from the reduction in the appropriation.

Mr. BUSBEY. I must have misunderstood you earlier. I thought you asked about the reduction that would have to be made in the number of investigations, rather than the number of investigators. Of course all of the reduction should not be applied against the investigators. I think there are some of the grades CS-13, 14, and 15 who could be dispensed with; some of the clerical help could be dispensed with; and some administrative help here in Washington could be eliminated.

Mr. CORBETT. We have here a typical analogy with the situation in the Internal Revenue Service: That if you have fewer investigators you are going to have more chiseling and less money coming into the Treasury, although in this situation it is not a matter of money coming into the Treasury, but the enforcement of laws which the Congress has said was to become the policy.

Mr. BUSBEY. Yes, but there have been times when they spent a lot of time investigating small shops, that in my humble opinion, was not necessary, in order to build up statistics.

Mr. CORBETT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, getting back to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the greater part of the reduction that is shown for that Department will likely be added later. I am frank to admit it, because it is due to the fact that the so-called McFarland amendment is to expire on September 30 of this year. It is my understanding that a bill is pending, and is likely to pass, which will reinstate the McFarland amendment for another year. If that bill does pass, we will, of necessity, have to entertain and pass a supplemental bill to make up that deficiency.

I cannot pass over the item for the American Printing House for the Blind without a brief comment, even though the appropriation is very small, and is the same as last year. I had the privilege of spending a day last summer, after

Congress adjourned, in the American Printing House for the Blind at Louisville, Ky. It was one of the greatest thrills and greatest treats I have ever had. I suggest that any Member of Congress who passes through Louisville should take time to go through that plant. The work they are doing is really remarkable. I do not know if the Membership is acquainted with this fact or not, but the Reader's Digest has contributed the major part of the money for the expansion of this worthwhile institution. Every month, they print some 225,000 copies of the Reader's Digest in braille, which reach sightless people the same day as the printed copies go on the newsstands. They are doing remarkable things down there, and I hope all of you will be able to visit that institution at some time.

For the Columbia Institution for the Deaf, the bill includes \$410,000 for salaries and expenses, the full amount of the request, and the same amount as appropriated in 1954. The bill also includes a construction item for \$259,000, which is an increase of \$19,000 over the request and \$218,000 over the amount appropriated in 1954. There was a request for \$240,000 for a library-classroom building that is needed very badly. This was approved, and an additional amount of \$19,000 was put in the bill by the committee to renovate a building as a stopgap measure to get a little extra gymnasium space that is needed very badly. The committee, as stated in its report, considered this only a stopgap. We also stated in the report that we believe it is time a building program for this institution be presented to the Congress; so that gradually, year by year, we can make this into a first-class institution, because it is the only institution of its kind in the world. The old dilapidated buildings that they are housed in at the present time are a disgrace, and I, for one, hope that they can present a program next year that will outline to the Congress a plan for presentable buildings.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I am very happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY].

Mr. THORNBERRY. I would like to say to the chairman that I am very grateful to him and to the members of his committee for the interest they are taking in what has been known as the Columbia Institution for the Deaf, which will be known as Gallaudet College. I was very much interested in the statement contained in the report about the desire of the committee for a future building program and by the statement which the chairman has just made. I want to concur in what he said about the great need out there. As the chairman has indicated, the buildings are dilapidated; there have been no buildings constructed out there since 1917, and before that, 1870. As I understand, the chairman's feeling is that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Budget ought to entertain and receive from them long-range construction plans so that they can start,

over a period of 10 years, to build a modern plant and make it a first-class senior college for the education of the deaf.

Mr. BUSBEY. Those are exactly my feelings.

Mr. THORNBERRY. What I want to do, and I think what the gentleman has suggested, is to get over to the Department and the Budget the feeling of this committee, as Representatives of the Congress, that we expect to be done for Gallaudet what was done for Howard University. Over a period of years, since the last building was built at Howard University, over \$25 million has been spent. I think that is fine, but I think the Congress should do for this school what they have done for Howard University. I appreciate the gentleman's interest.

Mr. BUSBEY. The gentleman from Texas knows, of course, that I cannot speak for the Congress, but I would say that is a correct evaluation of my thinking.

Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY] for coming before our committee and making a fine presentation. He has a very keen interest in this institution, as has our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]. If I am not mistaken, both of these gentlemen are on the board of the institution. Is that not correct?

Mr. THORNBERRY. Yes.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. It might be well to express our congratulations at this point to Dr. THORNBERRY, because he was honored in that there was conferred on him last Saturday the honorary degree of doctor of laws by this Columbia institution of learning.

Mr. BUSBEY. I am sure all our colleagues join in congratulating Dr. THORNBERRY.

The next item is the Food and Drug Administration. That was reduced only \$100,000 from the \$5,200,000 request.

For Freedmen's Hospital, salaries and expenses, the full amount of the request was allowed, \$2,880,000. That is a reduction of \$224,000 from the amount appropriated for 1954. The reduction below the appropriation for 1954 is more than counterbalanced by an estimated increase in reimbursements. The total amount estimated to be received from all sources in 1955, including this appropriation, is \$4 million; compared with \$3,905,350 for 1954.

I desire to say a little about Freedmen's Hospital. They have a very, very acute problem out there, and I only wish I had the ability to find the solution. I visited the hospital and went over it from top to bottom. The conditions are deplorable. The nurses have to work at a desk just outside of a washroom—a washroom that is not very presentable. The hospital is not laid out correctly. It is a very old building, as you know. I would hesitate to recommend spending additional money on this building, because I do not believe you could possibly

make it what would be considered, under today's standards, a first-class hospital. But something must be done, and it should be done in the near future. I am not making any specific recommendation, but am just calling attention to the problem. I think somebody should be working to find a satisfactory solution.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. This is quite a different subject than the one the gentleman is discussing. I have had a number of telegrams from my district asking me to vote for an amendment to be offered by Mr. FOGARTY which would propose to increase the appropriation for vocational rehabilitation by some \$26 million. Would the gentleman care to explain what is involved there, at this point?

Mr. BUSBEY. I think that question should be directed to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] when he takes the floor, which will be in a very few minutes. As a matter of fact, this is the first I have heard of his offering an amendment of that kind. I cannot comment on something about which I have no knowledge. But I am going to comment on the item of vocational rehabilitation and the formula that was written into the bill last year, when I come to that part of the report.

Mr. MORANO. Would the gentleman care to explain what the administration's proposal was for this?

Mr. BUSBEY. We will reach that item in a very few minutes. If the gentleman will withhold his question until that time, I shall appreciate it.

Mr. MORANO. I should be glad to do that.

Mr. BUSBEY. I shall be glad to explore the question thoroughly with him then.

For salaries and expenses of Howard University, the bill includes \$2,720,000, an increase of \$200,000 above the request, and \$185,000 above the appropriation for 1954.

I should like to tell you just a little bit about the situation there, because I am very much concerned about it. I had the pleasure of visiting the university on several occasions, after action on the appropriation last year. One day in particular, I made a rather thorough inspection of the powerplant and the other buildings at the university.

As you may recall, last year we had quite a discussion on the floor of the House concerning the committee's elimination of an item of \$150,000 for a turbogenerator that would have been used to furnish additional electricity to the new buildings that are under construction at the university. It was the committee's opinion then, and I think since then it has been concurred in by the General Services Administration and the people at Howard University, that, under the system we have worked out, the turbogenerator will not be necessary, and they will be in a much better position to furnish heat and electricity to the buildings at Howard University. The powerplant is in very bad condition. They had 17 breakdowns last

year. In order to put the powerplant back into good condition to supply heat to the buildings, there is an item of \$100,000 in this bill.

They made a plea that they need a generating plant, as well as the substation, for use of the students of the engineering school. A program has been worked out whereby they can have this plant for the school and also have a hookup with the Potomac Electric Power Co.; so that they will purchase their additional electricity needs from that company.

To install this electric switchboard will cost approximately \$100,000. To work the old electric generating plant, an expenditure of \$85,000 at least would be necessary for a new switchboard and gearbox; so for \$15,000 additional they can have this electric generating plant that is out there now, which will generate and carry up to 1,000 kilowatts, operating for the present buildings. If anything should happen to this particular generating plant, all they have to do is to throw the switch and they are cut into Potomac Electric Power Co. for the entire workload.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I have this observation to make in connection with the statement of the chairman. I realize that such institutions as the Columbia Institution for the Blind, Freedmen's Hospital, and Howard University all have single functions. They do not operate as a unit, like other institutions throughout the length and breadth of the land. I am sure the gentleman has made a fine study of the conditions that exist there. He and the committee are to be commended on the high quality of the work they are doing.

To revert to the question of the Food and Drug Administration, and may I say that the chairman gives every indication of having made a careful study of this, may I inquire in connection with the curtailment of appropriations when you reduce the personnel in such an administration whether there is danger that proper inspection cannot be made by the various bureaus, especially in this day of technical progress when synthetic products are being produced and the public could easily be defrauded. Is there any danger along that line?

Mr. BUSBEY. I think the gentleman from Illinois is justified in raising the question. Frankly, if I thought there was any danger, I would not vote for a penny of reduction. I do think there are a great many activities they are carrying on that properly belong to other departments. I have in my file in the office, and it is a very voluminous file, information to the effect that men in the Food and Drug Administration have spent a great deal of time chasing around the country trying to get witnesses against a certain spring water company, because, they claim, the company's advertising is misleading. I may not be right; but at least it is an honest judgment on my part that when it comes to something like that, the Federal Trade Commission is the proper body to have

jurisdiction over it, if it is important that any Federal agency spend the taxpayers' money on it.

A great deal of time and funds are used on things like that. Of course, this cut amounts to less than 2 percent. Most of the departments of the Federal Government, for the past 20 years, have been expanding and expanding and expanding. There was never any thought of contracting and getting some reduction in personnel. Now, we go back home and we talk about economy and we talk about reducing personnel, but when do we put this into effect? I do not believe this \$100,000 would hurt the essential inspections of the Food and Drug Administration one iota.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions to ask the gentleman, but with the gentleman's experience on the committee and with the experience of the committee, if he is willing to go on record as indicating that there is every reason to believe that this will not curtail the activities of this department or interfere with its operations, then I think we have an answer to this important question.

Mr. BUSBEY. That is my opinion.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

Mr. BUSBEY. This is certainly not a drastic cut.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. I am not familiar with the details of the case to which the gentleman refers, but for the record, I think, it might well be made clear that the Food and Drug Administration has jurisdiction over labeling of products which are falsely or improperly advertised whereas the Federal Trade Commission has statutory jurisdiction over advertising.

Mr. BUSBEY. That is correct.

Mr. EVINS. So the Food and Drug Administration would have jurisdiction over improper labeling.

Mr. BUSBEY. That is correct.

Now I would like to get back to the discussion of the appropriations for Howard University.

The bill includes \$1,150,000 for liquidation of contract authority for buildings. This is an increase of \$900,000 above the request, and \$1,150,000 above the amount appropriated for 1954. The budget included \$250,000 to provide funds for making final payments for construction of the biology-greenhouse building, which is scheduled for completion in fiscal year 1955. Congress has authorized the University to incur obligations and to enter into contracts for the construction of four additional buildings, a law building, an administration building, a men's dormitory, and an auditorium and fine-arts building. The obligational authority granted for these buildings is now impounded by the Bureau of the Budget and no plans for release were included in the budget. This authority was granted in June 1948 for the auditorium and fine-arts building, and in June 1949 for the other three. Since that time the existing buildings have, of course, deteriorated still more, so the current need is

even greater than at the time Congress authorized this construction. On the basis of recommendations made by the president of the university and a very thorough survey and inspection of the existing buildings by the chairman of the subcommittee, it appears that the most urgent need is for the law building and the administration building. The committee has therefore included \$200,000 and \$700,000, respectively, for these two buildings. This will provide sufficient funds to cover actual expenditures estimated for 1955.

The Congress has a duty and an obligation to see that Howard University becomes a first class, A-1, university as soon as possible, all factors considered. This is not only my hope, but I propose to do my part in making this goal a reality. The program that was laid out for Howard University some years ago has been on dead center for several years. The increase in funds recommended by the committee will get the program off of dead center and moving in the right direction. Let us keep it moving in that direction until the entire building program is completed and a faculty provided that will make Howard University one of our outstanding institutions of higher education in the United States.

I desire to express my sincere appreciation to my committee for accepting my recommendations for Howard University. Without their cooperation and assistance, the required additional appropriations would not be possible.

In addition, I wish to thank Mr. Russell Larmon, Assistant Secretary for Health, Education, and Welfare, for his suggestions and cooperation that were such an important part in this program. His sympathetic, understanding interest and counsel at all times were very valuable, and deeply appreciated.

I said at the commencement exercises, and I repeat here today in the House of Representatives, that I know of no president of a university or college in the United States who is more devoted and dedicated to his institution than is Dr. Mordecai Johnson, of Howard University. He has worked day and night for 28 years to bring Howard University to where it is today. I hope it is God's will that he remain as the head of Howard University to see his program brought to a successful conclusion.

With reference to the Office of Education, I will just hit the high spots.

For salaries and expenses, the bill includes \$2,900,000, a reduction of \$300,000 from the request and the same as the amount appropriated for 1954. An increase of \$200,000 was included in the original budget submission. It was primarily for the purpose of providing additional personnel and printing and binding funds for increased publications activities. The committee questions the need for the quantity of publications currently being produced, and certainly was not favorably impressed with the arguments for an increase. The remaining \$100,000 of increase was requested as a supplement to the budget for work in connection with the school assistance programs—payments to school districts and assistance for school

construction. The 1954 budget contains more funds for this purpose than have been provided for any previous year. The committee believes that amount is fully adequate.

For payments to school districts, the bill includes \$55 million, a reduction of \$3,500,000 from the request, and \$17,350,000 from the amount appropriated for 1954. The committee was informed that the request for \$58,500,000 took into account all savings which are estimated to result from changes in the basic legislation governing the program, but that the request was based on a continuation of Federal activities at the same level. It appears to the committee to be obvious that defense and other Federal activities are being, at least slightly, reduced. This will be reflected in a reduction in the requirements for funds under this program. The reduction of approximately 6 percent should leave an ample amount to pay all eligible applicants in full.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I recall that last year some cuts were proposed in the bill with reference to Howard University. In the report it was indicated that enrollment was falling off rather sadly. What is the situation there now?

Mr. BUSBEY. The enrollment is not as high as it was during the war years when they had the influx of GI's, but my personal opinion is that you cannot look at this thing from an overall enrollment standpoint. As soon as these new buildings get into operation and they get the staff and equipment, I am sure the enrollment will increase. I have no hesitancy in going on record to that effect.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think the House was disturbed last year by your report that the enrollment was decreasing and it seemed to indicate that the school was drying up. Has that trend changed?

Mr. BUSBEY. I think there are other factors to be taken into consideration than this drop in enrollment.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. How does it compare this year with last year?

Mr. BUSBEY. The enrollment for 1954 is exactly the same as 1953; namely, 3,119.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. As the gentleman knows, I am very much interested in the program for the promotion and further development of vocational education. I notice that your committee has recommended a reduction of \$298,750 in this appropriation for next fiscal year as compared with the amount allowed this fiscal year. I wonder if the gentleman would care to discuss that, and the reasons for it. I will say that this program is a very successful program in my district; and, as the gentleman knows, the George-Barden Act authorizes an appropriation of \$29,300,000 for the program.

Would the gentleman tell me why this was reduced as it was?

Mr. BUSBEY. You will see that the amount allowed this fiscal year is exactly the amount that was available last year. We enacted Public Law 286 last year, requiring each agency to pay for its penalty mail, but authorizing transfers between appropriations for the purpose of covering these costs. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare took \$298,750 from the vocational education appropriation to transfer to other programs in the Department to pay for this penalty mail. That left \$18,374,511, the exact amount in the bill for 1955.

I agree with the gentleman that this is not only one of the best programs, but one of the best operated program that we have in the country. I know the interest of the gentleman in this program, and I am sure it is shared by all of the Members of this body.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I hope the time will soon come when we can provide funds for increasing and expanding this program, because it is a good program.

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McVEY. I certainly thank the chairman of the subcommittee for the interest he has shown in vocational education. I know that the same amount is appropriated for the next year that they had during the current year. Does the amount appropriated provide for all the facilities now offered by the vocational education program?

Mr. BUSBEY. The same facilities as last year.

Mr. McVEY. Did not the Office of Education ask for any additional money?

Mr. BUSBEY. They did send up a supplemental request which brought it up to the amount of last year's appropriations.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I received a telegram this morning stating that it was \$6 million less than what the Graham-Barden Act called for. Is there any foundation to that?

Mr. BUSBEY. Yes; I think there is some foundation for it. It is analogous to the case where we appropriate \$65 million for hospital construction, when \$150 million is authorized.

Mr. DONDERO. But over all they are given the same amount as they got last year.

Mr. BUSBEY. Yes.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield.

Mr. GOLDEN. I think the gentleman knows I have been interested in this program for quite a long time.

Mr. BUSBEY. You certainly have. I will say that the gentleman has contacted me and consulted with me and advised me on many occasions.

Mr. GOLDEN. I am very much gratified to hear the chairman of this subcommittee say that there is no curtailment of the program. It has been very

successful in my district and I would hate to see any curtailment of one of the best programs we have ever had.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], who has always been keenly interested in this program.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I am well aware of the gentleman's interest in vocational education, but I still feel that the amount is inadequate. However, the question I want to put to the gentleman concerns vocational rehabilitation.

Mr. BUSBEY. Will the gentleman be so kind as to wait until I get to that item in the report?

Mr. PERKINS. Certainly, if the gentleman so desires.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Does the gentleman intend to discuss later the grants to States for maternal and child welfare?

Mr. BUSBEY. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. Then a question on that subject at this time the gentleman feels would be inappropriate?

Mr. BUSBEY. It would not be inappropriate, but I would prefer that the gentleman wait until I reach that item.

If you will look back in the table, you will find an item that was carried last year for school construction that is not carried this year. But in addition, you will find assistance to school construction, and I assure you it is one and the same item. During our hearings, I tried to get an explanation of why the language was changed, but I was not very successful. As it was set up in the budget, it is known not as "school construction" but "assistance for school construction" this year. The bill authorizes \$70 million, a reduction of \$4 million from the request, but the same as was appropriated for 1954.

I suppose somebody could question the reduction; likewise we can question the \$74 million that was requested. I am frank to admit that it was a guess on the part of the Department; it is a guess on the part of the committee. The reason for that is that they have a great many applications that have not been processed. Until they are processed, they do not know exactly what will be needed. Knowing the thinking of the House of Representatives, I am sure that if, after these applications have been processed, they should find that the reduction was too much, the House will appropriate the money that is needed to take care of those applications.

So let us be honest about it; theirs was a guess; ours was a guess; and I do not think they guessed too low.

Now we get down to the subject that interests many of us—vocational rehabilitation. The bill includes \$21 million, an increase of \$1,825,000 above the request, and a reduction of \$2 million below the amount appropriated in 1954.

The request of \$19,175,000 was calculated to be the maximum that the States would match under the provision that not more than \$1 of Federal funds may be granted for each 75 cents of State funds provided for the same purpose. By the time of the hearings it was estimated that the States will provide sufficient funds to match \$20 million. If the States increased the amount now foreseeable by \$750,000, they would be able to match \$21 million and thus make a total of \$36,750,000 available for the program, which amount is almost exactly equal to the amount available in 1954. The committee is sure that it was the intention of Congress, in placing the matching provision in the 1954 appropriation language, not to reduce the program, but to encourage the States to contribute a more nearly equal share in the financing of the program. With this in mind, the committee is recommending an increase of \$1,825,000 over the request, hoping and believing that the States will match this amount.

Basic legislative proposals have been submitted to the Congress which would make considerable changes in the total program for vocational rehabilitation and would provide special State matching formulas. Since these proposals are now being studied by the proper legislative committees, this committee has not included any new language in the bill regarding State matching. The committee is of the opinion, however, that the States should eventually match Federal funds at least dollar for dollar.

With reference to the formula, some Members have contacted me and asked about this so-called Busbey amendment. Your constituents are giving the subcommittee chairman, Mr. BUSBEY, a little too much credit, because it is not the Busbey amendment at all. I did favor the provision when it came up for action last year, and I still favor it. So that it will be on the record and clear once and for all, the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare in the House of Representatives did not recommend that formula. It was not in the bill when it passed the House of Representatives; part of it was written in the bill after it got to the Senate, and the rest was added in conference. The people who call it the Busbey amendment are giving me credit which I do not deserve.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Of course, if the gentleman had proposed the amendment in the subcommittee and had reported it to the House, it would have been subject to a point of order.

Mr. BUSBEY. That is correct.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of agitation to rescind this particular provision. I know of no way that it can be taken out in the House of Representatives, because if such an amendment were offered, I am afraid it would be subject to a point of order.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I think the matter should be made clear that what the conference committee did last year actually was to change the basic law by that amendment.

Mr. BUSBEY. I am sure the gentleman is correct.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. If we now attempt to change it back here, it will be subject to a point of order because it will again be changing basic law.

Mr. BUSBEY. That is also correct.

Let me call your attention to the fact that there is pending in the Congress at the present time a 5-year overall rehabilitation program of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. When that is passed, and I think it will pass, then the basic law will again be changed and the formula will be changed also.

Mr. Chairman, I did want to go into quite a bit of discussion on the Public Health Service program and other activities in the bill but my time is running short and I know my good friend, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is eager to take the floor. I will therefore ask that I be permitted to finish my remarks without interruption, and I will try to cover briefly the remaining items in the bill.

The first item under the Public Health Service is "assistance to States, general."

The bill includes \$13 million, a reduction of \$4,665,500 from the request, and \$250,000 from the amount appropriated for 1954. There was some reticence, on the part of the Public Health Service and departmental witnesses, to discuss candidly the method used in arriving at the estimate for this appropriation. It was clear, however, that there was a definite connection between the reductions of \$1,976,500 in grants budgeted for venereal disease control and \$2,275,000 in grants budgeted for tuberculosis control, and the increase of \$4,251,500 in grants under this item. The committee looks with strong disfavor on such lumping of these grants. If a disease for which special grants have been provided is on the decline, those grants should be reduced or eliminated, rather than being transferred to a general fund. On the other hand, if a disease is of sufficient national importance for the Federal Government to make grants-in-aid for its control, then the Congress should have control over the amount of such grants for that specific disease. The committee acted on the 3 appropriations discussed above, on the basis of the internal appropriation structure for 1954, rather than the consolidated approach used in the budget for 1955. Thus, \$3,200,000 of the \$4,665,500 reduction made from the request for this item was restored to the appropriations for venereal disease control and tuberculosis control.

Grants to States for public-health purposes are included in six separate appropriations. Since each of these appro-

priations also includes funds for direct operations of the Public Health Service, it is not possible to determine the amount of such grants from the bill. I

will, therefore, place in the **RECORD** a table to show the amount included in the bill compared with the 1954 appropriation, and the request for 1955:

Appropriation	1954 appropriations	1955 revised estimates	1955 bill
Assistance to States, general.....	\$10,135,000	\$14,386,500	\$9,725,000
Control of venereal diseases.....	1,976,500		700,000
Control of tuberculosis.....	4,275,000	2,000,000	4,275,000
Salaries, expenses, and grants, National Cancer Institute.....	2,250,000	2,250,000	2,250,000
Mental health activities.....	2,325,000	2,325,000	2,325,000
Salaries, expenses, and grants, National Heart Institute.....	1,125,000	1,125,000	1,125,000
Total.....	22,086,500	22,086,500	20,400,000

I will skip over some of those items where there is no major change nor controversy, but I must make a few comments about hospital-construction grants.

The bill includes \$65 million, a reduction of \$10 million from the request and the same as the amount appropriated for 1954. The Congress now has before it proposed legislation which would authorize appropriations totaling \$180 million over a 3-year period for construction of special types of hospitals and related facilities. In view of this, the Department included only \$50 million in the budget transmitted to Congress in January. Then, on May 11, a supplemental request of \$25 million was transmitted. The only reason that the Department was able to give for this 50 percent increase was that Congress was so slow in acting on their proposed new legislation that they were not going to be able to use the first year's \$60 million, and the supplemental was to replace what they would not be able to spend on the new program.

To the committee, this sounded more like an excuse than a reason. In the absence of an emergency, Congress seldom acts hurriedly on such an important legislative proposal as the extensive amendments proposed by the Department to the Hospital Construction Act. The committee does not believe that those at the head of the Department are so naive as to think otherwise. There was absolutely no testimony given the committee to indicate that a greater need for Federal hospital construction funds for this program exists now than existed a year ago when the Congress provided \$65 million.

I will not spend time discussing each of the National Institutes of Health, individually. The bill includes \$73,393,000, an increase of \$2,265,000 above the request, and \$2,240,000 above the amount appropriated for 1954. The table which I will insert in the **RECORD** sets forth the committee's recommendations compared with the request and the appropriations for 1954:

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1954	Estimates, 1955	Recommended in bill for 1955	Bill compared with—	
				1954 appropriation	1955 estimates
Operating expenses.....	\$4,675,000	\$4,675,000	\$4,675,000		
National Cancer Institute.....	20,237,000	19,730,000	20,237,000		+\$507,000
Mental health activities.....	12,095,000	12,460,000	12,460,000	+\$365,000	
National Heart Institute.....	15,168,000	14,570,000	15,168,000		+\$598,000
Dental health activities.....	1,740,000	1,730,000	1,740,000		+10,000
Arthritis and metabolic disease activities.....	7,000,000	7,270,000	7,270,000	+270,000	
Microbiology activities.....	5,738,000	5,930,000	5,930,000	+192,000	
Neurology and blindness activities.....	4,500,000	4,763,000	5,913,000	+1,413,000	+1,150,000
Total, National Institutes of Health.....	71,153,000	71,128,000	73,393,000	+2,240,000	+2,265,000

As can be seen from the table, the increases above the budget estimates, recommended by the committee are, with one exception, to restore cuts. The committee would be the first to recommend reductions in these funds, or the elimination of Federal appropriations for these programs, if it were shown that we can now prevent or cure these diseases, or that the incidence of these diseases is substantially declining. In all the voluminous testimony received by the committee, there was no indication that any of these things has happened. It was demonstrated that advances have been made in gaining a much better understanding of the problems involved, which should provide a basis for greater advances in finding preventatives and cures for these dread diseases. To start cutting back, right at the time when the prospect for really great discoveries is the brightest, seems very shortsighted.

A concrete example of what really great discoveries may be in the offing has apparently been produced by the Neurology and Blindness Institute. The committee was told by Dr. Bailey, director of that institute, of the discovery of a substance called glutamine, which has been used with such success in the treatment of 10 very serious cases of epilepsy, that he believes it to have more promise for effectiveness than did streptomycin for the treatment of tuberculosis and ACTH and cortisone for the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis. It was stated to the committee, by one authority in this field, that if this one discovery proved as effective as preliminary tests indicate it to be, it will, just from a financial point of view, be worth more to the Nation than the entire cost of all of the National Institutes since their beginning. Dr. Bailey estimated that it would require a minimum of \$1 million to com-

plete tests and to pave the way for commercial production of this product. The committee, therefore, has included \$750,000 more than the budget request to cover a portion of this cost, and will expect the institute to provide, from the base appropriation, any reasonable additional amounts needed.

The committee has also included an additional \$400,000 above the amount requested for the Neurology and Blindness Institute to initiate a research program on blindness. The committee was very surprised to learn that the Clinical Center program for blindness is, to quote the Director, "a sort of a standby program." This problem is certainly important enough to warrant much more than a standby program at the Clinical Center.

The National Institutes of Health predoctorate fellowship program was transferred, in the 1954 budget, to the National Science Foundation. This was accomplished by a transfer, in the President's budget, of \$390,000 from the NIH. This amount of money was intended to provide approximately 200 predoctorate fellowships. The committee was advised that, as a result of this shift, approximately 140 fewer such fellowships were granted than would have been granted had the program remained in NIH. The committee is quite disturbed about this precipitous decline in so vital a program and desires that the NIH use funds provided in the bill, to reinstitute this program in 1955 on a scale which will make up the loss that has occurred. The committee further desires that in 1956 the part of this program remaining in the National Science Foundation be returned to the National Institutes of Health.

I should comment on the action taken on the Office of the Secretary, but I believe the rest of the remaining items should not require comment, in view of the time remaining for debate, unless there are questions concerning them. For the Office of the Secretary the committee has allowed \$1,075,000 plus a transfer of \$171,000 from the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund. This, in total, is \$75,000 less than the amount of \$1,321,000 appropriated for 1954. However, during 1954 numerous transfers were made from other funds of the Department in order to provide for activities in the Secretary's office. Such transfers are estimated to total approximately \$300,000 in 1954. The committee has placed a limitation of \$200,000 on such transfers for 1955 and will expect the budget for 1956 to be prepared on the basis that all activities will be appropriated for directly.

The bill includes a total of \$2,125,000 for salaries and expenses, Office of Field Services, a reduction of \$185,000 from the request, and \$85,000 from the amount appropriated for 1954. A provision has been included in the bill to provide not less than \$850,000 for the Grant-in-Aid Audit Division. This is an increase of \$125,000 for that Division, whose very important work of auditing the expenditure of billions of Federal dollars is now far from current and steadily falling further behind. The value of these audits is very greatly

diminished as a result of their being delayed, in some cases 2 years or more after the expenditures being audited. In the opinion of the committee, the reduction provided for the field services activities under this appropriation can be absorbed at no detriment to the Department's programs.

I wish to make it crystal clear that it is the desire of the committee that the increase of \$125,000 for the Grant-in-Aid Audit Division be used exclusively for the employment of additional field auditors and payment of their traveling expenses. In other words, the committee does not expect the Grant-in-Aid Audit Division to be charged with any expenses from the Field Services Division that have not been customary charges in the past.

In addition, I am sure the committee will look with disfavor on the idea of closing regional offices to absorb any reduction in appropriations.

It was quite evident from the hearings that the methods used in handling exceptions, by the Federal auditors, to payments to State agencies is cumbersome, time consuming, and very inefficient. The committee strongly recommends that the present procedures be reviewed, by others than the program people, with the thought in mind that audit exceptions be handled directly from the State level to the headquarters in Washington and if not resolved between the Grant-in-Aid Audit Division and the constituent involved, be referred directly to the Office of the Secretary.

Before giving up the floor I desire to say this: First of all, I do not believe anyone could have enjoyed working with his colleagues on the subcommittee as much as I have. I wish especially to pay by respects to the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, who was the chairman of the subcommittee for 4 years, a man who has served on the committee 8 years, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. His knowledge and experience on this subcommittee have meant a great deal to me and to the committee. I wish to state publicly that I personally appreciate his cooperation and his splendid work that has meant so much to this committee, particularly in the field of the health programs. I assure you that I share his feelings on these programs of research at the National Institutes of Health in cancer, heart, mental, arthritis, microbiology, neurology, blindness, and the other research programs they carry on. I am not going to say something I would like to, because I know that he would appreciate very much telling the House the story of the new product they have developed out there, glutamine, which seems to be the answer to the cure of epilepsy; and with that I am going to leave it to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

But before sitting down I desire also to pay my respects to the clerk of our committee, Mr. Robert Moyer, who has been a tower of strength. Very frankly, I do not know what I would have done without him. He has been unselfish with his time. He has made a conscientious and thorough study of these items—a

task which no Member of Congress could possibly do, and take care of all his other activities and chores. I am extremely grateful to Mr. Moyer.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Illinois how his committee justified a cut in vocational rehabilitation in the amount of \$2,035,500, since we have more than 2 million people today that could be rehabilitated, and since we have an additional 225,000 coming on every year and at the present time only rehabilitating approximately 60,000 a year. How do you justify the cut under the circumstances?

Mr. BUSBEY. Under the formula there will not be a cut if the States match the amount in the bill under the 75 cents-\$1 formula.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 60 minutes.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I think I should make reference to the fact that a year ago when we appeared before this committee to justify the appropriation for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, it was with good fortune that we had in the chair at that time my distinguished neighbor and outstanding Congressman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON]. I think, because of his fair rulings and his presence in the chair, it was one of the reasons why we were so successful last year in getting a good bill adopted by the House. And I am very happy to see him here again. I know he is going to be just as fair, and I am sure we are going to get a good bill this year.

Mr. Chairman, I have served on this committee for the past 8 years. I do not believe in those 8 years that we have gone into an appropriation bill any more thoroughly than we did this year. That is one of the reasons we are so late in reporting this bill to the House.

I want to say for the RECORD that the chairman of the committee, Mr. BUSBEY, of Illinois, has been one of the fairest chairmen I have ever worked under. He has been extremely fair to every witness who appeared before the committee. He has been very fair to those of us on the minority side. If there was any Member of the House of Representatives who appeared before our committee, or anyone from the Department of Labor or the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare who appeared before the committee who did not make a full and complete résumé of his activities, it was his fault and not the fault of the chairman or of the committee itself.

I should like to say a word about the clerk of our committee. This is the fourth or fifth year he has been with the committee. As the chairman of the committee has already stated, he is one of the best clerks we have on the Committee on Appropriations and in my opinion is worth more than any special investigator who could be hired by the Committee on Appropriations, for the

Congress or for the committee itself. I am speaking, of course, of Bob Moyer.

Mr. Chairman, I think we have a pretty good bill this year although there are some places where I do think we have cut too much. In the Department of Labor, as you will notice, the first cut was \$55,000 in the Office of the Secretary. I believe all of that cut was taken out of International Labor Affairs. The next sizable cut appears in the Bureau of Labor Standards where the Department, for the third year in a row, asked an appropriation of \$100,000 or more to deal with the problem of migratory farm workers of this country. I am referring to those American citizens who are migratory farm workers.

It was testified before our committee 3 years ago that when Herbert Hoover was President, in the late twenties or early thirties, he appointed a commission to study the conditions of these migratory workers. That commission reported back at that time that the conditions under which these migratory workers were living in the States where that help was used was indescribable. The conditions were worse than anybody could describe. After Herbert Hoover came Franklin Roosevelt and he, as President, appointed another commission to make a thorough study of these same conditions. His commission reported the same findings as the commission that was appointed by Herbert Hoover. Harry Truman appointed another commission when he was President and his commission reported the same findings; that something should be done for these workers to improve their living conditions in the various States.

Three years ago the first request was made of this committee to appropriate something over \$100,000 to make a study and recommendations to the various States, as to how to handle this particular program. This is the third year in a row that such an appropriation has been requested and it is the third year in a row that it has been turned down.

The President of the United States, General Eisenhower, said only a few months ago that while he is President of the United States he does not want to see any second-class citizens in this country. Neither do I. I do not think any Member of this House wants to see what we would term a second-class citizen. But if there is such a thing as a third-class citizen or a fourth-class citizen, certainly the migratory farm workers of this country would come in that class. We have second-, third-, and fourth-class citizens in the domestic migratory farm workers.

Until the time the Congress does something about it, you are going to allow these workers and their children to live under conditions you would not allow an animal to live under in your own home town or on your own farm or in your own home. In some of these States and communities these people are not wanted, they are not liked. They are shunned in every respect. Until the Federal Government does something about it, those conditions are going to prevail. I think it is the responsibility of this Congress to initiate this action, to appropriate this

\$100,000 this year to make a start in this field, because if we do not it is our fault and the responsibility, I think, lies on our shoulders for not doing it.

The next sizable cut is a cut of \$110,000 in the Bureau of Employment Security. That cut of \$110,000 is misleading, for this reason: In the salaries and expenses item in connection with the Bureau of Employment Security we have provision for the Veterans' Employment Service. Cuts were made in that division over the past 2 or 3 years on the basis that employment was high and we did not need these contact workers in all the States because of high employment in the country. However, during the past year or two, because unemployment has grown and there are many unemployed veterans at the present time, we had a unanimous agreement in the committee that we should raise the funds for the Veterans' Employment Service from some \$700,000 to \$1,100,000, which we did.

In agreeing to that raise, I did not expect we were going to penalize the Employment Services Administration here in Washington to the tune of \$400,000 in order to build up the Veterans' Employment Service, and that is what we have done. So instead of there being a \$110,000 cut, as shown in your report, this is actually a cut of over \$500,000 in the Employment Services salaries and expenses here in Washington.

As a member of this committee, I cannot see any logic in making a cut like that, because it was only a few years ago we passed a bill here in Congress, I think unanimously, to provide unemployment compensation for the war veterans returning from Korea. That program was to be administered by the Bureau of Employment Security here in Washington. This year they have asked for \$56,600,000 for unemployment compensation to these veterans. I understand there is also a request before the Bureau of the Budget at the present time for an additional \$88 million, which would be about \$140 million that would have to be paid out to these Korean veterans in unemployment compensation by the people in the employment services here in Washington.

When this program was adopted a year or two ago, we told them to absorb the administrative cost of this new program, which they did. Now, after we have asked them to absorb the cost of this administrative program, the funds are being doubled, their work load is going up, and we come in here and ask the Congress to help the committee justify a cut of \$500,000 in the Employment Service. It just does not add up to me. At the same time in the grants-to-States, we have over \$200 million and on top of that, they have pending at the present time a supplemental for the next fiscal year of over \$40 million in State grants. In the unemployment compensation program, and yet with that additional of over \$40 million, we are asking the Employment Service to take a cut of over \$500,000. It just does not make sense to be cutting a program like that on the one hand and asking them to take the increased work loads on the other hand. I understand at the same time that there

is a budget request for \$90,000 additional for salaries and expenses. Here we are in effect today—this committee, this Congress or this House, cutting the employment services by \$500,000 when they are before the Bureau of the Budget asking for an additional \$90,000 for 1955. What sense does that make? It does not make any sense to me.

With reference to the grants-to-State item, we have left that as is, but we have made a contingency fund out of the \$216 million of \$16,400,000. But in the bill we had last year, we asked the States to absorb all salary costs or increases. I think that is an unfair thing to ask the States to do. It was not in the original law, and I do not think it was ever the intent of Congress to make the States, out of their own funds, pay for all salary increases in the administration of these unemployment compensation laws because this fund is not a drain on the Federal Treasury. This money is the three-tenths of 1 percent which is paid by the employers into the Federal Treasury as a fund to be paid to compensate for the administration of these grants in the various States. As a result of the collection of that three-tenths of 1 percent, the Federal Government is making a profit of about \$60 million a year. Why in the world do we come in here and ask that the State grants be held to that minimum when, in effect, they belong back in those States—these funds do not belong in the Federal Treasury—these funds are collected for the purposes of administering this law and to be turned back to the States—and it was the intent of Congress when this bill was passed that those funds also go for the paying of all salary increases in the States—as I was saying, why we should make that recommendation, I do not understand. I do not think we have a right as members of the Committee on Appropriations to come in here repealing or amending existing law as we are here by demanding that the States assume this liability which is not theirs in the first place.

The next cut is in the Wage and Hour Division. Last year the largest cut in the Department of Labor was against the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor. I think the reason for this was mainly because it is an enforcement agency. It enforces the Fair Labor Standards Act, with its minimum wage and overtime laws and the very important child-labor provisions. This year we are appropriating an even \$6 million. It was testified in our committee this year that the Division will have collected in this fiscal year over \$8 million in back wages which were owed to employees. In other words, because of the administration of this program—I do not remember the number of employees involved—but employees are going to get back \$8 million, or \$2 million more than the total cost of the program.

The cut last year meant that they had to close 3 regional offices and 22 district offices. I do not recall at the present time the number of investigators who will be separated this time nor the number of offices that will have to

be closed because of this severe cut of over \$200,000. I have always maintained, as a member of this Appropriations Committee, that if we do not like a particular law, if we do not like the Fair Labor Standards Act, if we are against the wage-and-hour law, if we are against the 75-cent minimum-wage law, if we are against the child-labor provisions of this act, we ought to be men enough to come in and ask that the act be repealed through the proper legislative methods of Congress, and not by these back-door attempts, cutting appropriations. We should not amend the law by cutting the appropriations to such an extent that they cannot be enforced and by such action, in effect, amend or repeal the law in a round-about way.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I am a little confused by your remarks. I understood what you said about the wages of 8 million having been given back to the workers and yet you felt that was a good thing.

Mr. FOGARTY. Oh, yes.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. If that was done in spite of the very heavy cut, it would suggest there was greater efficiency in spite of the cut.

Mr. FOGARTY. Perhaps I misled the gentlewoman from Ohio. But the facts showed there were 16 million owed, of which only 8 million was returned to employees to whom it was due. The point I have been trying to make is that this indicates that some violations of the law are not being corrected because of a lack of investigators. A sum of \$16 million in wages owed employees due to failure to pay a minimum wage or to properly pay overtime shows that some firms are taking an unfair competitive advantage over other law-abiding concerns. In my opinion, the way to correct this is to provide a sufficient staff to this agency to assure that all intentional violators of the law will be brought into line.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman. I was quite confused.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentlewoman for bringing that to my attention, because it is a good point.

With reference to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the chairman did a good job in explaining the item for the American Printing House for the Blind, and Columbia Institution for the Deaf. I yield to the gentleman from Texas on the item for Columbia Institution for the Deaf, because I told him I would at the time I reached that part of the bill.

Mr. THORNBERRY. I thank the gentleman. A moment ago I addressed the chairman of the subcommittee, and I wanted to ask the gentleman from Rhode Island, as the ranking minority member of the committee, with reference to this item. In the committee report I notice the committee states it is the strong desire of the committee to bring in plans for the construction of these buildings. Is it the gentleman's idea that the Department of Health,

Education, and Welfare, and the Bureau of the Budget would entertain from the institution or from the school a request for plans and for buildings that are badly needed at that institution?

Mr. FOGARTY. I do. I think I expressed those thoughts in the hearings, that they should come up with some definite type of program, like that for instance which was developed at Howard University, a 5-year or a 10-year program, because I remember very well when the committee agreed to the 10-year program at Howard University, and we watched the results of that program. If we are ever going to get anything done at this university, we must urge the Department to do more than they have in the past, because they have never come up with a recommendation to this committee for such an extensive program that we have talked about this year. I thank the gentleman from Texas for bringing this to the attention of the House, and the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the committee, Mr. BUSBY, and I thoroughly agree with his remarks. I hope that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will next year come before us with some kind of a definite program so that we can make that a first-class educational institution.

Mr. THORNBERRY. I certainly thank the gentleman from Rhode Island, and I appreciate what the committee is doing.

Mr. FOGARTY. Now the next cut that I think was too large was the cut in the Food and Drug Administration. Someone asked about this cut in the Food and Drug Administration. This cut of \$100,000 from the budget allowance for the Food and Drug Administration amounts to about 2 percent of the current funds. It means that the American public will get 2 percent less protection in services under the food and drug law against dangerous foods, drugs, and cosmetics which menace the public health; against filthy, decomposed, and polluted foods unfit for human consumption; and against cheats and frauds such as the sale of worthless remedies for serious diseases, or the substitution of margarine for butter, or the pumping of water into dressed poultry as a make-weight.

It means that the inspection of factories and warehouses producing or storing these commodities will be reduced from an estimated 7,800 in the current year to about 7,650. It would reduce the rate of inspection of the 96,000 establishments subject to the law from 8.1 percent each year to about 7.9 percent, or in other words, the average length of time between visits would be increased from 12.3 years to 12.5 years. Of the many tons of filthy and polluted food seized every day several would escape detection under a reduced program and would go on the consumer's table.

These reductions would not be so significant if present operations were adequate. Last year Food and Drug appropriations were cut 8.1 percent, resulting in cutbacks in work on sanitation, severe cutback of work on frauds, and in failure to keep pace with needed health work.

Even before that, data submitted to the committee showed that the Food and Drug Administration examined, either through factory inspection or the examination of representative samples, less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the total production of foods and drugs. This contrasts with what the Government is doing to protect the Nation's meat supply by appropriating nearly three times as much to the Department of Agriculture for the enforcement of the Meat Inspection Act and to provide for that service about 3,000 employees. The Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act applies to all other foods and to all drugs, cosmetics, and therapeutic devices, the consumer hazards from which are several times as great as those from meat and meat food products. Yet at its peak in fiscal 1951, before these cuts totaling nearly 10 percent were made, the enforcement personnel of the Food and Drug Administration was only 944.

Establishments producing meat and meat products are under continuous inspection. All foods produced therein are subject to rigid scrutiny. Yet establishments subject to the food and drug law are visiting on the average of once in every 12½ years and now we are proposing to visit them even less frequently.

The trend toward less and less inspection of these vital commodities to insure their integrity and safety is fraught with such peril, particularly with the rapid increase in the number and kinds of food being produced and the creation of new miracle drugs, all of which have their hazards, that we must recognize as a matter of self-protection the value of this service. It is just as essential to our welfare as the work of the FBI. Certainly the public would gain far more than its cost even if the present annual levy of 3¼ cents per capita to support this service were multiplied several times.

To come in here this year and ask this Administration to take another cut of \$100,000 does not make sense to me, and I do not think it makes sense to the American people.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. The gentleman may recall that I made inquiry about this subject when the chairman of your committee had the floor. Probably the gentleman from Rhode Island could tell us or enlighten us to some extent at least in this regard: If we had a cut last year of \$600,000—and the gentleman has stated that we did—what were the repercussions by reason of that cut? Did the Department function less efficiently? Or did we get into the situation the gentleman has explained we might get into if we fail to have enough inspectors to be a deterrent to the quacks, fakers, food adulterators, and synthetic medicine dispensers? Was last year's cut too drastic?

Mr. FOGARTY. It was testified before the committee that they had to make a cut in the number of drugs investigated, in the number of frauds exposed; and it was in the fraud area the

gentleman mentioned last where the largest cut came. We cut the appropriation over 8 percent last year and the biggest cut was applied against the frauds that exist in the country at the present time.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. What was the incentive, then, for cutting the appropriation another \$100,000 this year if you just about balanced out with your \$600,000 cut last year?

Mr. FOGARTY. I think I explained my position. I cannot see any sense in it at all. I was at the hearings and as far as I know there was no justification at all in the hearings for cutting this one dime. In my opinion, we should have restored the \$500,000 or \$600,000 cut that we made last year.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. This Congress passed a law in the last session which permitted the Pure Food and Drug Administration to make certain inspections that had been barred by the Supreme Court of the United States. What use is such a statute if we deprive the Pure Food and Drug Administration of the money necessary for making these inspections?

Mr. FOGARTY. The law does not mean anything. That is the answer.

The next cut that I thought was too much was in salaries and expenses in the Department of Education. Why in the world we cut that item by \$300,000, I do not know. They had a supplemental bill before us for \$100,000 for 1955. So we not only cut out the \$100,000 that they requested in the supplemental but we also cut them another \$200,000 or \$300,000 under what they asked for.

Mr. Chairman, if I had faith in the appointees that are made by the President of the United States, I think I would back them up with the necessary amount of money to function properly. I refer particularly to Dr. Brownell, Commissioner of Education. Based on his appearance before our committee, he appears to be an outstanding educator. I think he is a good administrator; he is doing a fine job and I think he wants to do a good job for education. He testified before our committee that he could not get along with less money than he presently has. He testified before the committee that he wants to do a good job for education; that he needed these funds to do it; yet without any justification in the hearings at all we come along and say, "We think you can get along with \$300,000 less than you are getting along with at the present time."

Here is a man who has only been in office 5 or 6 months, since last fall. He was named Commissioner around September of last year. He has to take care of these White House conferences on education involved in the bills we passed a couple of weeks ago.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. BUDGE. The gentleman stated that the Commissioner of Education said he could not get along with less

funds than he has now. It is my understanding this bill calls for exactly the same funds as were provided for fiscal year 1954, is that not correct?

Mr. FOGARTY. Maybe I said he could not get along with less funds than he has at the present time. What I should have said was that he stated he could not get along with less than he was asking for in 1955.

They tell me that the Bureau of the Budget is pretty rough down there, yet they allowed them approximately \$3,100,000, and again this year while we were considering this bill they allowed another \$100,000 for salaries and expenses. We did not pay any attention to that at all. We just cut out the \$100,000 and then took out another \$200,000. I listened very attentively to Dr. Brownell. I think he made a good presentation on the problems of education in this country. Unless we have the proper leadership at the Federal level in this country and give men like Dr. Brownell, who is Commissioner of Education, the tools to work with, the educational standards in this country are going to continue to go downhill. They will not stabilize nor will they get to where we want them.

As far as funds for Public Laws 874 and 815 are concerned, it is a guess on our part. I agree with the chairman it is also probably a guess on the part of the department because these laws were tightened up in the last Congress. I think they were tightened up too much. I think there should be some changes made in the existing law. I think the absorption clause of 3 percent should be changed by the proper legislative committee because I think it is very unfair in these federally impacted areas. But, there is nothing we can do about it, as an Appropriations Committee, to change that absorption formula or existing law. As the chairman said, when these applications have been presented and O. K.'d, then it will be up to the Congress to appropriate sufficient funds to pay 100 percent of all these entitlements under the law.

Take the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation. There has been considerable talk about that to date. I was not here last year when the conference report was adopted; I was not one of the conferees. Had I been, I would never have agreed to the formula that was put in by the Senate making the States put up 75 cents for every dollar appropriated by the Federal Government as a matching fund in the vocational rehabilitation grant program. I have said now for 8 years in a row that of all the programs in the Government this is one of the most important that I know of. It has been testified before our committee year after year after year that for every dollar that we appropriate in Federal funds the Federal Government receives \$10 back. Now, if we are economy minded and we want to make some money for the Federal Government, we should not be cutting this appropriation or agreeing to this restrictive language. We ought to be doubling this appropriation if we can get \$10 back for every \$1 we appropriate. For 8 years now I have

never heard a Member of the Congress or a witness before our committee dispute the claim that we get back \$10 for every one appropriated; in fact, every witness that I heard talk about that claim said that it was on the conservative side; that a more liberal estimate would be \$15 for every \$1 we expended. Now, if we want to make money for the Federal Government, here is one way to cut down the Federal budget by increasing the fund for vocational rehabilitation. The chairman stated awhile ago that he does not see how we can do it now because this amendment was agreed to in conference last year, speaking of this 75 cents for \$1 formula. He does not see how we can change it now. Well, my answer to that is that the House never had a chance to vote on that amendment. It should have been given a chance to vote and express its opinion on that amendment. I will have tomorrow at the desk an amendment that will repeal in effect that restrictive language. I do not expect we will know until the amendment is offered on tomorrow whether it is going to be germane and in order. But, I am hoping that it will be so that the House will be able to vote on this particular formula, because when the conferees agreed to the Senate formula last year they were agreeing to change the basic law. All I want to do tomorrow is to offer an amendment that will get us back to the basic law, and if the amendment is accepted, I will then offer an amendment to increase this fund from \$21 million to \$23 million to get us back to where we are at this year's level. When Miss Switzer was before the committee I asked her this question: How much more money would it take to rehabilitate 5,000 more people. She claimed that this year they expected to rehabilitate 65,000 people, but with this restrictive language in the bill requiring the States to put up 75 cents for every dollar, it means that about 6,000 people less will be rehabilitated in the coming year or only 59,000 people instead of 65,000. That is what that amendment means.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. BUSBEY. Of course, the gentleman's statement would be true if the States did not come up to the matching formula. But if they did, they would be able to rehabilitate the same number next year as they rehabilitate this year; is that not correct?

Mr. FOGARTY. I agree with the chairman. But the fact is that we have no reason to believe that any State is going to match these funds to the extent to which we are appropriating them—that is \$21 million today. I am not willing to stand here and take the chance on something like that. I am not willing to stand here and take the chance on restrictive language that we have placed in the bill, under which language we deny rehabilitation rights to about 6,000 people in this country in the coming year. Unless we repeal that restrictive language, that is what I am afraid will happen. That over 5,000 people will not

be rehabilitated, and instead of the number being 65,000, we will be down to less than 60,000.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. How could a State like Pennsylvania, for example, match this fund when its legislature is not in session?

Mr. PERKINS. That is the point; more than half of them are not in session.

Mr. FOGARTY. It cannot; but on the other hand, the statement was made a year ago that something should be done about some of these matching formulas. Around that time the President had appointed a Committee on Federal-State Relations, and I thought they were coming up with an overall program of Federal-State matching in these grants-in-aid programs. As everyone knows that committee has bogged down. Until that committee reports or until we get something definite, I think we ought to stick with the original law as it was passed and get rid of this restrictive language. If we are going to do something and change the law, then we ought to say that in 2 years or 3 years from now—of course, we cannot bind another Congress either; but we can say, in effect, that 2 or 3 years from now we believe that a formula like this should go into effect. That would give the States some advance notice.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. The States have had a warning of the possibility of the adoption of language of this sort, have they?

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not believe they have, because I did not know about it until January of this year. I was not here last year when this language was adopted by the conferees.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the chairman, yes.

Mr. BUSBEY. In line with the comment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], it was put into the 1954 bill, and it was set out very plainly that it would not take effect until 1955. That takes care of the warning to the States. As to the other question that the State legislatures are not in session this year or some of them are not in session—in fact, most of them are not; that is true—there is no year when you can put anything like that into effect. They may say, "Why don't we wait until next year?" What would be the situation next year? If we wait until next year all the State legislatures will have met and adjourned before we get an appropriation bill through the House of Representatives. So there is no right year. Pick any year you want and you have the same problem confronting you.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. What does the gentleman propose in addition to removing the restrictive language? Does he propose to increase the amount from \$21

million to some other figure and, if so, to what figure?

Mr. FOGARTY. If the language is found to be in order and we are able to remove that restrictive language under the amendment that I will offer here, then I will offer an amendment to increase the amount of \$21 million to \$23 million, to bring it back to what they have in this fiscal year and keep the program as is.

Mr. MORANO. If the amendment is not in order, then what does the gentleman propose to do?

Mr. FOGARTY. Then it will be up to the Senate. The Senate can still do something about it. I asked Miss Switzer if 65,000 people would be rehabilitated, how much it would cost the Federal Government to rehabilitate 5,000 more. The answer was \$3 million. It would cost us \$3 million to rehabilitate 5,000 more in this program. In a year the Federal Government would receive back \$1 million of the cost, and at the end of 3 years the Federal Government would have been repaid the \$3 million it cost to rehabilitate those 5,000 people, and 5,000 people would have been rehabilitated and the Federal Government would have been paid off in a program like that. If that program does not make sense there is no program in the Federal Government that makes sense. If that program does not spell economy in the operations of our Government, I do not know what spells economy.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. In the gentleman's opinion, would not the suggestion the gentleman made a moment ago about the removal of the restrictive language for the time being but giving notice that the formula the gentleman referred to might be worked out over a period of 2 or 3 years answer the statement made by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBY], that there was no fit time to do it from the States' viewpoint? If a period of 3 years is proposed to work out a formula, that does provide a specific, definite time for working out such a formula.

Mr. FOGARTY. All I can say to that is, in my opinion, this language should never have been agreed to by the House. It should never have been put in there by the Senate. It was amending existing law. We ought to get rid of it. We ought to get back to the original law and then wait and see what happens to the new legislative proposals that have been proposed in this field by the present administration.

Mr. PRIEST. May I say to the distinguished gentleman that I concur fully with his viewpoint in that respect.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Will the gentleman tell us whether this restrictive provision put in by the conferees last year was ever requested by the administration?

Mr. FOGARTY. No; it was not requested by the administration. As I understand, someone in the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation volunteered to save some money by making this a closed-end appropriation, but I understand the Senate insisted, "Let us go further than that and make this further restriction by making the States pay 75 cents to every dollar." As a result, many States are going to be penalized.

Mr. CANFIELD. Does the gentleman perhaps know the attitude of the administration on the provision at this time?

Mr. FOGARTY. I think that Miss Switzer, who administers this program, testified to the effect that she would like to see it removed from the bill. I think the hearings would bear that out.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would like to express my personal appreciation to the gentleman for the remarks he has made in connection with the need for additional funds for the vocational rehabilitation program and vocational education, and also the necessity for eliminating this restrictive language.

May I say further I would like to be associated with his remarks on the incredibility of a cut in employment security funds at a time when we have a mounting problem with regard to the unemployment areas in this country now. To me, it is incredible that we would cut the amount of money available for that program and that problem at this time.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman.

Now we go into the Public Health Service.

For 4 or 5 years now, maybe longer than that, the Bureau of the Budget and the administration have been trying to foster assistance to States, generally, and to get us out of the field of categorical grants such as those for tuberculosis, venereal disease control, and others. This year they did the same thing. They cut down the grants to States for venereal disease control from \$5 million to \$2,300,000, and the grants to States for tuberculosis from \$6 million to \$3,500,000.

Then they came back later on with a supplemental for assistance to States, general. But I am very happy to say that the committee was in full agreement on the provision that we keep these figures in categorical line items so that when we are appropriating funds for venereal disease control and tuberculosis control programs, we know what the funds are being spent for. In any other way, we would not know what they are being spent for. So we have changed the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget in this respect, and have put back in the venereal disease control program \$700,000 and in the tuberculosis program \$2,500,000 and subtracted that from the assistance to States in general. I hope as one member of this committee that when the Bureau of the Budget and the administration consider this item again they do not attempt again next

year to lump all these programs into one item. If they do, we will just have to take corrective action again.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is familiar with the fact that a bill has already passed through this body which allows the States to shift these funds from one item to another to take advantage of this particular program which the Department has recommended. Is that not true?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is true. It has passed the House and is now in the other body. I, for one, hope that bill does not become a law because it weakens the public health program.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say to the gentleman—and I certainly respect his view—many of the States are requesting that this be done in order to allow them to emphasize a particular program which they feel is of great need to them. For instance, in many of the States venereal disease has been practically brought under control of the local health authorities, and where it is not particularly needed in some States I know it is true where they would like to emphasize TB or cancer or some of these other programs where they are allowed to shift funds from one program to another. Does the gentleman not believe that there is some merit to that?

Mr. FOGARTY. I think there are arguments on both sides. But there are many health officers in this country who might be enthusiastic about cancer or heart disease or TB, and they might spend three-quarters of what they get on one of those programs, and we would not know what they were spending the money for until the year after it had been spent. That is the basic fallacy in such a procedure.

Mr. SPRINGER. I agree with the gentleman that that is true, but I do believe that there is merit in that because the local State authority balances the funds as they believe it to be best. I think the gentleman is also familiar with the fact that under the pending bill each one of the States must set up a plan so that the Federal Government knows that these moneys are expended and how it is being spent. There must be some kind of general overall plan, I believe, which will give us in this country in years to come a more uniform plan for improving health along the lines set out in these particular items.

Mr. FOGARTY. We will have to deal with that program if, and when, it becomes a law.

Mr. Chairman, the next item I want to refer to is the item of hospital construction: The so-called Hill-Burton hospital-construction program. In 1946, the Hill-Burton Act was passed. It was originated in the other body by Senator HILL and Senator BURTON who is now on the Supreme Court. It was a bipartisan bill. There were no politics in it. It passed by a unanimous vote and when it came to the House, it passed here by a unanimous vote. The program worked so well that in 1949, the act was amended and extended, and the authorization was

doubled from \$75 million a year to \$150 million a year. In 1950, or 1951, we gave the full appropriation of \$150 million. That was the only year this was done because we were then getting into the Korean conflict. It was cut back after that to \$75 million. Last year, the House cut the figure back for the first time from \$75 million to \$50 million, the biggest cut this program has ever suffered. The Senate then raised it to \$75 million. I think you will remember the vote we had last year to raise this from \$50 million to \$75 million, which lost on a rollcall vote by six votes. I am very happy to say that every Member of Congress who voted for that \$75 million last year has been vindicated, because the administration this year asked for \$50 million and then came back with a supplemental for \$25 million, making the request this year for \$75 million. So every Member who voted for this amendment last year has found out they were justified by the action of the administration in making the request that we appropriate \$75 million this year for hospital construction.

When we look at the hearings, there is nothing that justifies this cut. In fact, the hearings justify an increase. We could spend \$250 million this year on applications that have already been approved for the construction of hospital facilities in this country. If the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would come before our committee and say, "We are gradually meeting the needs of hospital beds in the country; we are about even on this line of safety," then perhaps we could cut back. But the facts are that because of obsolescence in all hospitals we cannot even maintain our present level without the Federal program. There is no way of keeping up with the increased need today. We are running behind about 3,000 hospital beds a year at the present time.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I am in full accord with the position of the gentleman relative to the cut. I have heard no argument to justify a reduction of a single dollar from that recommended by the administration, namely, \$75 million. I think it might be some news to the Members that if we left the appropriation at \$65 million, \$51 million of that amount has already been spoken for in connection with construction projects throughout the various States. Therefore, I say to the gentleman now that I expect to offer an amendment to restore this sum from \$65 million to \$75 million, and I know that I can justify my position in that respect.

Mr. FOGARTY. I will say to the gentleman that the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare testified before our committee that there is still a shortage of over 600,000 beds in this country at the present time; that we need to construct about 36,000 beds a year to keep up with the increase in population. The population is increasing about 2½ million each year. With all the prepaid health insurance plans, new methods of surgery, and other advances in medical

fields the people are getting more hospital-minded, and as a result there is more of a demand for hospital beds today than there has ever been before. Unless we do something about it we are not going to meet that demand.

I think the history of this act will show that when the Federal Government participated in the construction of these hospitals it also brought along more private funds with it. As Federal funds went down, private funds went down.

So this program has not only been a program that provided 100,000 beds, it has also stimulated private groups throughout the entire country to do more than they would have done if we did not have the Hill-Burton Act.

I do not know of a program that is more effective than this program. There is no politics in it; it is nonpartisan, and it is a States rights program; it is a program that gives to the States at the local level the right to determine where these hospitals are to be built, to determine how big they are to be. They raise the matching funds at the community or State level, and I think it has been one of the best-run programs in the Government.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I wish to ask the gentleman a question for clarification.

I want to say for the information of the gentleman that I am in favor of the original budget request of \$75 million; but I understand the committee's position to be that legislation is being proposed to make \$180 million available for hospital purposes over a 3-year period. Should we pass this legislation would that in any way defer the facilities which might be provided under the provisions which were discussed this morning?

Mr. FOGARTY. I think I can explain that. The administration this year asked for the appropriation of \$50 million. There is still an authorization of \$150 million, but they only asked an appropriation of \$50 million. Later they came to this House with legislation which they called a new bill. I think the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] made the statement, and I agree with him, that it should not have been a new bill but should have been an amendment to the Hill-Burton Act, and I think he was right—they came to the House with legislation that authorized \$62,500,000 this first year for the construction of hospital facilities for the treatment of chronic diseases, nursing homes, diagnostic treatment centers, and rehabilitation facilities. It is a 3-year program totaling \$180 million, approximately. What happened is that the bill has been hung up, the legislation has not been approved, and we do not have a dime of the \$62,500,000.

However, the administration—I presume thinking they would not get that bill this year—said, "We had better come out and ask for \$25 million more in the event we do not get the authorization legislation through for the \$180 million

3-year program;" and that is the reason they asked us to appropriate \$25 million additional to the \$50 million which would make it \$75 million.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. But if the additional legislation were passed authorizing \$180 million in a 3-year period, the additional \$25 million would not be necessary; is that correct?

Mr. FOGARTY. No. It would still be necessary because the \$25 million goes for general hospital construction.

As I understand, the intent of the new legislation was to pinpoint the necessity of providing facilities for the treatment of chronic diseases, pinpoint it at the State level to get them to come up with a program.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, perhaps I can clarify the matter a little.

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. There is no overlapping whatsoever in reference to the bill that passed the House for additional hospital construction for these particular types of diseases, that is nursing homes and so forth. There is some overlapping with reference to rehabilitation and mental hospital beds. There is no overlapping whatsoever in the matter of the general hospital beds.

As a result, since the Hill-Burton Act as now authorized applied mostly to the general hospital construction program that would have no effect whatsoever on this program. The \$75 million would still be needed. It is just a question of whether or not we are going to try to provide these additional beds for general hospital construction under this program.

Our committee was very careful to try to make it clear that this new hospital construction program would in no way interfere with the Hill-Burton Act or with the hospital construction program that has been under way since 1945.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman very much for his very clear answer to my question.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, during the years of my service in the Congress I have been and will continue to be an ardent supporter of measures to strengthen the health programs in our Nation.

In 1946 when the Hospital Survey and Construction—Hill-Burton—Act was passed by the 79th Congress it was because of a great demonstrated need for hospital beds and the resulting services. The testimony of all the leading authorities from the hospital and health field boiled down to two basic facts: One, we do not have enough hospitals and services; and, two, we need financial help from the Federal Government to match local funds to build hospitals. The Congress responded on a bipartisan basis and has continued to support this Hill-Burton program on a bipartisan basis in both Houses.

In 1949, after several years of operation, it was recognized that appreciable inroads were not being made on the bed deficit which had accumulated during the 20 previous years of economic depres-

sion and then a world war. Again on a bipartisan basis the Congress extended the life of the program and doubled the annual authorization for appropriation from \$75 million to \$150 million.

Because of the necessity for budgetary restriction, occasioned by the Korean and international situations, the \$150 million appropriation was only available to the States for 1 year. In addition, the factor of inflation in recent years has not helped in the struggle to meet the ever increased bed need.

Last year this 83d Congress appropriated only \$65 million, the lowest level yet attained. It was last year, too, that this Congress extended the duration of the program for 2 more years without changing it in any way. I point out, for the sake of emphasis, that the basic authorization for \$150 million annually was not changed.

This program is providing for over 100,000 beds to date. It is producing results, but it must overcome several ever present factors which work against acquiring adequate hospital beds. These are the factors of first, an annual population increase in excess of 2½ million people; second, the constant loss of hospital beds through obsolescence. In the general hospital category, alone, we are losing in excess of 6,000 beds each year through depreciation and obsolescence. These factors, alone, account for an annual need of at least 36,000 beds, without regard to the great accumulated deficit.

At the present time the States are reporting a bed shortage from 700,000 to over 800,000. An appropriation of \$65 million is inadequate and our Nation will continue to fall behind. I have observed that as the Federal assistance drops off so, too, does hospital construction done without Federal aid drop off in recent years.

Two other observations may be made. While we, as a Nation and under this program in particular, are making noteworthy progress in fulfilling the need for general hospital beds, the progress in the other categories is extremely slow, particularly in the mental disease and chronic disease categories. There is little possibility of ever effectively meeting these needs without a Federal construction incentive. The other observation I should like to mention is the fact that there is a backlog of actual projects reported by the States which could utilize immediately \$270 million in Federal funds for the 1955 fiscal year; and over \$400 million in 1956 and 1957.

As a bare minimum the appropriation for next year should be \$75 million for construction purposes. This would be one-half of the amount authorized in the basic law and would be fully in accord with the recommendations made by the President to the Congress on May 11, 1954, when the President requested \$75 million for this phase of the program.

I do think that adequate funds should be provided for the administration of

this program at the Federal level. An increase to \$75 million in construction grants should carry with it an increase in the salaries and expenses item.

It is essential that sufficient funds be provided to support the wishes of Congress to have this job on behalf of our peoples' health well done.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service, Division of Hospital Facilities—tentative allotments to the States and Territories for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, under the Public Health Service Act (title VI), as amended

STATE AND TERRITORY		Allotment ¹
Total.....		\$75,000,000
Alabama.....	2,677,734	
Arizona.....	495,535	
Arkansas.....	1,611,213	
California.....	3,227,864	
Colorado.....	642,266	
Connecticut.....	556,536	
Delaware.....	200,000	
District of Columbia.....	200,000	
Florida.....	1,952,624	
Georgia.....	2,730,542	
Idaho.....	324,745	
Illinois.....	2,398,572	
Indiana.....	1,765,095	
Iowa.....	1,187,406	
Kansas.....	1,008,424	
Kentucky.....	2,312,917	
Louisiana.....	2,045,225	
Maine.....	534,266	
Maryland.....	957,924	
Massachusetts.....	1,721,001	
Michigan.....	2,466,128	
Minnesota.....	1,512,226	
Mississippi.....	2,112,260	
Missouri.....	1,885,012	
Montana.....	228,439	
Nebraska.....	610,536	
Nevada.....	200,000	
New Hampshire.....	272,980	
New Jersey.....	1,493,828	
New Mexico.....	469,317	
New York.....	3,345,920	
North Carolina.....	3,321,117	
North Dakota.....	321,691	
Ohio.....	2,963,822	
Oklahoma.....	1,475,431	
Oregon.....	644,128	
Pennsylvania.....	4,181,319	
Rhode Island.....	311,934	
South Carolina.....	1,864,828	
South Dakota.....	330,108	
Tennessee.....	2,546,569	
Texas.....	4,477,016	
Utah.....	399,750	
Vermont.....	221,214	
Virginia.....	2,232,848	
Washington.....	859,830	
West Virginia.....	1,328,849	
Wisconsin.....	1,514,311	
Wyoming.....	200,000	
Alaska.....	200,000	
Hawaii.....	227,620	
Puerto Rico.....	2,197,543	
Virgin Islands.....	23,537	

¹ Based on:

(a) Total population of the continental United States as of July 1, 1953, and Territories as of July 1, 1952, as estimated by Bureau of the Census.

(b) Allotment percentages for the fiscal years 1954 and 1955, as promulgated in the Federal Register, September 5, 1952.

² Minimum allotments of \$200,000 as specified in the Public Health Service Act (title VI), as amended.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service, Division of Hospital Facilities—Tentative allotments to the States and Territories for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955 under the Public Health Service Act (title VI), as amended on the basis of a \$65 million appropriation, H. R. 9447

STATE AND TERRITORY		Allotment ¹
Total.....		\$65,000,000
Alabama.....	2,315,357	
Arizona.....	428,474	
Arkansas.....	1,393,169	
California.....	2,791,039	
Colorado.....	555,348	
Connecticut.....	481,220	
Delaware.....	200,000	
District of Columbia.....	200,000	
Florida.....	1,697,023	
Georgia.....	2,361,019	
Idaho.....	280,798	
Illinois.....	2,073,974	
Indiana.....	1,526,226	
Iowa.....	1,026,715	
Kansas.....	871,954	
Kentucky.....	1,999,911	
Louisiana.....	1,768,446	
Maine.....	461,964	
Maryland.....	828,289	
Massachusetts.....	1,488,099	
Michigan.....	2,132,388	
Minnesota.....	1,307,577	
Mississippi.....	1,826,409	
Missouri.....	1,629,915	
Montana.....	200,000	
Nebraska.....	527,913	
Nevada.....	200,000	
New Hampshire.....	236,038	
New Jersey.....	1,291,669	
New Mexico.....	405,804	
New York.....	2,893,118	
North Carolina.....	2,871,672	
North Dakota.....	278,157	
Ohio.....	2,562,730	
Oklahoma.....	1,275,762	
Oregon.....	556,958	
Pennsylvania.....	3,615,464	
Rhode Island.....	269,720	
South Carolina.....	1,612,462	
South Dakota.....	285,435	
Tennessee.....	2,201,943	
Texas.....	3,871,144	
Utah.....	345,652	
Vermont.....	200,000	
Virginia.....	1,930,677	
Washington.....	743,470	
West Virginia.....	1,149,017	
Wisconsin.....	1,309,380	
Wyoming.....	200,000	
Alaska.....	200,000	
Hawaii.....	200,000	
Puerto Rico.....	1,900,150	
Virgin Islands.....	20,351	

¹ Based on:

(a) Total population of the continental United States as of July 1, 1953 and Territories as of July 1, 1952, as estimated by Bureau of the Census.

(b) Allotment percentages for the fiscal years 1954 and 1955, as promulgated in the Federal Register, September 5, 1952.

² Minimum allotments of \$200,000 as specified in the Public Health Service Act (title VI), as amended.

Mr. HARRIS. If the gentleman will yield further, I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman for his support of this program.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island has consumed 1 hour.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman has been one of the most outstanding supporters of this program in the interest of the general public, and it is a very fine outstanding program that has proven its worth.

I want to compliment the committee for the consideration the committee has given to this program. I wondered, however, since the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JONAS] has indicated that he was going to offer an amendment to increase the amount to the budget figure, I have wondered whether the gentleman from Rhode Island did not have in mind offering an amendment to increase it to the budget figure of \$75 million.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. As I understand it, the gentleman from Illinois will offer that amendment. I am very hopeful he will have broad support on both sides of the aisle. I would like to point out that those who are deeply interested in seeing self-help and mutual cooperation should be supporting this amendment, because this relies very heavily on State contributions. It is getting the whole program off the ground, because the Federal Government is leading in getting that program off the ground that would not otherwise have gotten off. I think there is ample credit to the gentleman from Rhode Island and the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think one of the most important phases of this bill is the Public Health Service. As you know, the Public Health Service of this country contains seven institutes on health, namely, the National Cancer Institute, Mental Health Institute, the National Heart Institute, Dental Health Institute, Arthritis and Metabolic Institute, the Institute of Microbiology, and the Institute of Neurology and Blindness.

All of these institutes were created by the Congress, the first of which was the Cancer Institute back in the middle forties. The last two, the Arthritis and Metabolic Disease Institute and the Neurology and Blindness Institute in more recent years. This House and this committee have taken the lead in appropriating funds for research into the leading causes of death by appropriating funds for these institutes I am talking about now.

I was never any more sincere in my life than when I tell you this afternoon that of all the acts that we may have taken credit for in this Congress, the outstanding one is the support we have given to carrying out the functions of these National Institutes of Health.

I remember very well when these programs were started. I first served on the committee with Frank Keefe, of Wis-

consin, chairman of the committee at that time. I do not believe any man ever served in this House who did more for the public health of the people of our country than Frank Keefe when he was chairman of the committee. It was my happy privilege and honor at that time, in 1947 and 1948, to work hand in hand with him, as well as with my friend over here, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] in getting these programs started. It was in 1947, by unanimous vote of our committee, that we in fact committed future Congresses to the building of one of the greatest research institutes in all the world. This Institute was opened and dedicated a year ago this month down here in Bethesda. It is called the Clinical Center of the National Institute of Health. That cost the taxpayers of this country to buy the land, to draw the plans, to build the buildings, to furnish equipment, and to staff it about \$61 million or \$62 million. We hope in the next fiscal year that this 500-bed clinical center will be in full operation. We have been told by leading medical scientists from all over the country and from our own outstanding doctors in the Public Health Service that there is nothing like it in the country or in the world. Through the expenditure of this \$60 million we eventually are going to find out what kills people because of cancer, what causes heart disease, what causes multiple sclerosis, and muscular dystrophy, and cerebral palsy, what causes arthritis and rheumatism. We are going to find out what causes not only death, but we are going to find out what causes these crippling diseases in mankind.

When the total economic burden of these diseases—in terms of private hospital construction costs, in terms of the Federal budget for medical care, in terms of family medical bills, in terms of lost wages and lost production—is set against our total national investment in the medical research that will eventually eradicate the diseases that give rise to the costs, the picture is badly out of focus. The economic burden of cancer alone exceeds \$10 billion per year. Compensation and pension payments to veterans in 1950 because of heart disease disabilities were \$168 million, and one insurance company alone paid out \$174 million for deaths due to heart disease. The direct cost of caring for the mentally ill in public hospitals and for pensions to afflicted veterans is more than \$1 billion per year, and this cost is going up at the rate of \$100 million per year.

And what are we spending for research on these diseases? Two hundred million per year totally—from private giving, from endowments of educational institutions, from industry, and the Federal Government. If we had the people and the facilities, \$500 million per year would be a worthwhile investment. To fail to give the existing group of trained scientists the funds that they can effectively use in existing laboratories—and they do not now have adequate funds—would be such a glaring legislative error that it can be attributed only to ignorance or misinterpretation of the facts on the part of Congress.

This House has in the past acted on medical research measures in a most statesmanlike way. We have played a major part in lifting the sights of the whole Nation toward a total national medical research effort that we need. I certainly hope and I have great confidence that the appropriation bill now before you will be modified so that this pattern can be continued.

We need a medical research program for the Nation that will permit the full capacities of the scientific brains of the country to work most effectively on the cause and cure of disease. Furthermore, we need a program that looks to the future by increasing this pool of scientists and expanding their laboratory and clinical research facilities.

The reason we need such a program is that anything less is pennywise and pound foolish. For the long pull, the only way that we are going to reduce the tremendous cost of medical care is through research. Any plan for payment of medical care costs—no matter what kind of plan it is—simply redistributes the cost or helps individuals to arrange better for the payment of medical care costs. We urgently need better means of financing medical care, but we should never make the mistake of assuming that this gets at the root of the problem. Medical care programs do not reduce the total cost of illness. In the same way, building more hospitals helps us take care of sick people better—and we need more medical facilities—but construction of hospitals does little to reduce illness. The first Hoover Commission recognized these basic facts. That Commission pointed to the long run futility of centering attention on care of people who become ill, when the real answer is to abolish illness at the source through research.

This line of reasoning—plus the simple moral and human obligation to reduce human suffering—has set us on the path toward a rational national medical research program.

When this drive to expand medical research began, we were taking a calculated risk that the expenditure of money for research would pay off. We were assured by competent scientists and research administrators that if only funds were made available to pay modest salaries to investigators and technicians, to equip their laboratories adequately and to buy the experimental drugs and animals that they need, results would follow—first in the form of increased knowledge about disease and then in the form of specific methods of treatment, prevention, diagnosis, and control of disease.

Now the payoff is beginning.

Rheumatic heart disease is literally on the way out as a major health problem.

New and more effective drugs to keep high blood pressure under control have been developed.

Poliomyelitis is going to be as rare as smallpox in this country as the result of the intensive research drive of the past few years.

Recent discoveries about the nature of cancer of the cervix make almost every cast of this kind of cancer curable. The problem has been reduced to one of early

diagnosis and treatment. Now that the research people have completed their task, extensive demonstrations are needed to bring the research findings to physicians in private practice and in public clinics.

These advances are a token dividend on our national medical research investment. They are impressive, and they show valid progress. But we are not going to discover cures for all forms of cancer, heart disease, and mental illness for many years to come. Continuing progress is going to depend directly upon our willingness to expand support for medical research.

We took another calculated risk when we undertook to establish medical research on a reasonable scale with the help of Federal appropriations. It was theoretically possible—and some people thought practically certain—that the entrance of the Federal Government into medical research would cause a reduction in private support for research.

It has worked out that the expansion of Federal support for medical research has not been a deterrent to private support. On the contrary, the Federal programs have been viewed as a symbol of our national determination to conquer disease, spurring additional giving for medical research by individuals, voluntary agencies and industry. On this point, the testimony of those splendid individuals who voluntarily devote their time to the work of the great private organizations that are raising funds for medical research is unanimous.

I quote from testimony given before the health inquiry of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WOLVERTON]:

Does the creating of the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness and the appropriations for it in any way diminish private effort?

Answer. Absolutely no; it only increases it. (Carl M. Owen, first president, National Multiple Sclerosis Society.)

The greatest stimulation to research in this field, as in others has come from the Federal Government, and it is to Washington that we have looked finally for that implementation of the neurological research effort which will supplement on a broad scale the efforts of the voluntary health agencies and individuals working under university or institutional auspices. (Statement prepared Oct. 7, 1953, by the National Committee for Research Into Neurological Disorders.)

If it had not been for the National Institutes of Health research programs of the past few years, it seems particularly certain that medical science and work going on in voluntary and State institutions throughout the country indeed would have been very heavily handicapped. The method of administration of these grants * * * is probably one of the most extraordinarily successful ways in which public funds can be utilized with about as complete freedom as is possible. (Dr. T. Duckett Jones, medical director, Helen Hay Whitney Foundation, New York.)

A great part of the success of this effort can be attributed to the way in which the Public Health Service has administered the funds appropriated for the support of medical research. The National Institutes of Health, the part of the Public Health Service that has direct operating responsibility for the

research grants program, has gained the complete confidence of scientists and the universities and medical schools where the scientists work. Medical scientists from all over the country are brought in on the process of making grants. There is absolutely no Federal control over the work of scientists when they get their research funds. We can have complete confidence that funds administered through the National Institutes of Health will be prudently and wisely spent.

Now President Eisenhower knows these facts, and he subscribes to the philosophy that I have stated. Let me quote his message of January 18, 1954, to the Congress on the health of the American people:

In addition, the Public Health Service should be strengthened in its research activities. Through its National Institutes of Health, it maintains a steady attack against cancer, mental illness, heart diseases, dental problems, arthritis and metabolic diseases, blindness, and problems in microbiology and neurology. * * * In such direct research programs and in Public Health Service research grants to State and local governments and to private research institutions lies the hope of solving many of today's perplexing health problems.

These are words to which I subscribe 100 percent.

I subscribe to more than the President's words. I am for a program that will make the words a reality.

The President's budget for the National Institutes of Health does not strengthen medical research as he urged in his message. His budget proposed that progress toward adequate support of research in the medical schools and universities of the Nation be stopped cold.

I pointed out this fact repeatedly in the subcommittee hearings on the National Institutes of Health appropriation.

We heard full testimony from scientists and physicians who are national leaders in the fields of heart disease, cancer, neurological diseases, and mental disorders. They recounted again for us the tremendous research progress that has been made in dealing with these diseases. They made perfectly clear that the disservice that will be done to the American people if we fail to exploit the discoveries that have been made and that will continue if the scientists' work is adequately supported.

In the face of this testimony, the Committee on Appropriations has reported out a bill which will curb the advance of research in cancer, heart disease, mental health, arthritis, and diabetes.

The committee report justifies the proposed appropriation for the National Institutes of Health in these words:

The committee would be the first to recommend reductions in these fields, or the elimination of Federal appropriations for these programs, if it were shown that we can now prevent or cure these diseases, or that the incidence of these diseases is substantially declining. In all the voluminous testimony received by the committee, there was no indication that any of these things has happened. It was demonstrated that advances have been made in gaining a much better understanding of the problems involved,

which should provide a basis for greater advances in finding preventatives and cures for these dread diseases. To start cutting back, right at the moment when the prospect for really great discoveries is brightest, seems very shortsighted.

I agree with the committee's premise, but not its conclusion. It is not noticeably less shortsighted to hold the appropriation at practically last year's level than it would have been to cut back.

We have at hand the opportunity to enter into a golden age of medical research at a cost which is almost infinitesimal in relation to the cost of disease, in relation to the certain economic returns on the investment, and in relation to far larger expenditures for less productive purposes.

I have no understanding of an approach to support of medical research which starts from the assumption that maintenance of the status quo is a great favor.

I have to disagree fundamentally with the proposition that our objective should be to hold medical research support at a constant level.

Consider specifically what the committee report proposes. It holds support for cancer and heart disease in fiscal year 1955 at the level of the 1954 appropriations. It does practically the same for the fields of arthritis and mental health. A 3 percent increase is allowed for the budgets of the Institutes concerned with these diseases.

The only bright spot in the bill as reported out is an increase in the appropriation for the National Institute of Neurological Diseases to expand research on epilepsy and blindness. Even here the approach is niggardly. More intensive work both on basic problems and directly upon muscular dystrophy, cerebral palsy, disorders of hearing and other neurological diseases is needed, and no provision to support the work is made.

If this bill as reported out becomes the appropriation act, the leadership which this House has taken over the years in establishing a sound medical research policy for the Nation will have disappeared. Sound policy is full use of the brains of the research scientists of the Nation to conquer the diseases that cripple and kill millions of our people every year. Leadership in making this policy a reality should be kept by the House.

The testimony that we heard in the subcommittee, and even more extensive testimony given last October at the health inquiry held by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, shows that within existing facilities, there is a tremendous backlog of productive research that will not be done unless additional funds are made available.

We should not force this work to remain on the shelf. By appropriating an additional \$4 million for fiscal year 1955, a good share of the most urgent work that would otherwise be delayed can go forward.

I intend to offer an amendment to increase by \$1 million the appropriation for each of four institutes, the National Cancer Institute, the National Heart Institute, the National Institute of Mental

Health and the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness.

What specifically, could be done with an additional \$4 million?

All of the money should go for research and research training in the medical school, university, hospital, and foundation laboratories of the country. These are all non-Federal institutions. Witnesses from the National Institutes of Health stressed to the appropriations subcommittee the importance of stimulating research in non-Federal laboratories.

This money would permit the National Institutes of Health to pay a large volume of meritorious research grants that would have to be turned down if the appropriation reported out by the Committee on Appropriations were accepted.

The most promising young persons headed for doctors' degrees in the sciences related to medicine could be helped to secure this advanced training. The amounts proposed by the Committee on Appropriations are so low that every cent going to the support of pre-doctoral fellows must be subtracted from the support now provided for training at more advanced levels.

Research in a number of very promising scientific areas could be stimulated without decreasing support from other urgent areas. For example, the possibilities of chemical treatment of cancer are, according to witnesses of the highest competence who testified before the Subcommittee on Appropriations, just beginning to be realized. New drugs, particularly effective in treating leukemia, are being found and tested. Work of this kind should be extended widely and rapidly, but not at the expense of other fields of cancer research.

The one enlightened step taken by the Committee on Appropriations was to increase funds available for study of the new drugs—glutamine and asparagine—that have such promise for treatment of epilepsy. Every field where a lead of this sort exists—not only the field of epilepsy—should be similarly exploited. For example, a drug called lysurgic acid may provide leads to the cause of schizophrenia. This should be fully and quickly tracked down. Promising studies on nerve regeneration, with ultimate benefit to thousands of paralytics, should be pushed ahead.

Another most important thing which support at an expanded level would permit is the inauguration of a policy providing more secure and stable long term support of research that requires long uninterrupted work over a period of years. One of the most prevalent complaints about the Public Health Service research grant program from scientists is that the period of support is too short. This is not the fault of the Public Health Service, which has had to balance the expenditure of limited funds between long-term support for established scientists and shorter term support for younger scientists. More adequate funds will permit the Public Health Service to begin the extension of longer term support, where this is clearly indicated on scientific grounds, and at the same time

give the promising young scientists a better opportunity.

The appropriation reported out by the committee will permit more effective research use of the additional beds to be opened in the clinical center during the coming fiscal year. On the basis of results to date, this is no time to hamper the research in progress and planned.

Approval of increases in the appropriations for the National Institutes of Health will rectify the errors made by the Bureau of the Budget and make a first step toward establishing in fact the program which the President has recommended in his health message.

We must look to the future of medical research—at the 10 years ahead—as well as at the coming year. A rational national medical-research policy calls not only for full use of the brains now available, but for a long-run expansion of our medical research capacity. The time is at hand to consider expanding the medical research laboratories of the country so that as research is extended and as the pool of competent scientists expands, modern, well designed facilities will be available. Experience under an earlier program for research-construction grants showed that the Federal funds stimulated local giving, and, far from removing responsibility from the shoulders of people in their home communities, actually served as the sparkplug for local campaigns. Now, the need is greater and we cannot delay much longer in expanding the Nation's medical research laboratories.

The Public Health Service has on hand requests for medical research construction aid totaling \$150 million. The budgetary situation is such that we can realistically hope to meet only a small part of these needs in the immediate future. I believe, however, that the resumption of grants for construction of laboratory and clinical research facilities on a realistic scale is a matter of high priority in order to balance the total medical research picture. It is my personal belief that these needs are so pressing that they will pass any test of essentiality, even at a time when all Federal expenditures may be reviewed with extreme care.

I ask the Members of the House to weigh these proposals on their merits. It is my deep conviction that the logic behind them is sound and that medical research expenditures pay for themselves many times over—in the reduction of human suffering, and in direct economic returns to individuals and to the Nation as a whole.

I said in the full committee last Friday morning that I wished every member of that committee would take the hearings of our committee, turn to page 402 and read the testimony that was given to us by Dr. Bailey, who heads the Institute of Neurology and Blindness. I do not think there is a clearer-cut example of how our Federal funds are being spent for research and the gains that we are making at the present time. This institute is only 3 years old. This is the third year that we have appropriated funds for it, and they have some of the

outstanding neurologists in the country working out there. I think that you might be amazed to know that there are some States in this country that do not have a single trained neurologist, because of such a severe shortage with adequate training. We are trying to do something in this program by providing funds for doctoral courses in neurology and psychiatry and other vacuums in the medical profession at the present time. But Dr. Bailey told us of one discovery made out there this past year. He told us of a person who had epilepsy. It was the story of a young man in his late thirties who had a fall when he was 3 or 4 years old, and for some 30 years he had averaged between 5 and 10 epileptic seizures a day until last year. He was referred to the Clinical Center by the University of Virginia Medical School. They had tried everything they had at that point. They sent him down to Bethesda. He was operated on because of the development of new surgical techniques developed out there, and as the result of that operation last September the young man today has a job. He is working for the first time in his life, and he has not had a seizure since last September because of that one operation. Because of that operation and other kindred work, they came across a deficiency in the brain of glutamic acid, and as the result of that research and the experience in that field, they came up with a substance called glutamine to compensate for that deficiency. But we had to drag out of Dr. Bailey some of these facts because he had not been authorized specifically to tell us about them. We have glutamine available now that they think can cure epileptics. They have obtained several positive reactions, about 10, where the seizures were not only relieved but disappeared. If this one discovery that glutamine can control epilepsy as insulin controls diabetes, the \$60 million that we appropriated to build the building that houses that institute will be worth every dime and more that we have appropriated in this Congress.

I would like to tell you of the advances that have been made in research in cancer, in heart disease, in rheumatism, and in neurological disorders. I said in the full committee the other day that there are some things I never heard of until a few years ago, until I became a member of this committee. I had never heard of multiple sclerosis until about 5 years ago when I met a friend of mine from Rhode Island who was down here attending a fish and wildlife convention. He was walking around on 2 crutches. I asked him what his trouble was and he told me he had multiple sclerosis. I had never heard of it; perhaps I had heard the term, but I had no idea what it meant. That happened to be about the time when we were holding hearings in the spring of 1948-49. Some of the doctors of the Public Health Service came before us and I asked them about multiple sclerosis. I found out at that time that it was something that medicine did not know very much about. It takes an average of 6

years even to diagnose it. There is not a thing we can do for it. We cannot even relieve the people who have it. And it is a progressive disease.

I asked the question at that time, "What are we doing about it? How much money are we spending on it?" And the answer I got was about \$30,000 a year was being spent on multiple sclerosis.

I am very happy to say that this year it was testified that we are going to spend in the neighborhood of \$275,000 on it. Also, it was discovered a couple of years ago on the island of Guam in the Pacific that a cousin of this disease, amyotrophic lateral sclerosis—the disease that Lou Gehrig died of—is 50 times more prevalent than in this country. So with some of these funds that we appropriate for research for these Institutes, the Institute of Neurology sent a team of scientists out to the island of Guam last year. We expect and we hope that that team will come up with some finding that will give us a lead or a clue to the cause of this most dreadful disease. And if they do, it will be worth every cent that we have spent on it.

I could tell the same story about muscular dystrophy. I could tell the same story about cerebral palsy in children.

I do not think I have to remind this House or the Congress or the people of our country that 25 children a day are being born, every day in the year, with cerebral palsy. I do not think I have to remind the Congress or the people of this country that 800,000 people are going to die this year because of some form of heart disease. I do not think I have to remind the people of this country that over 200,000 people are going to die this year because of some cancerous condition; that over 50 million people living today are going to contract cancer sometime between now and the time they die and half of them are going to die because of it.

I do not think I have to remind the Congress and the people of our country that over 50 percent of all the hospital beds in our country today are taken up with the mentally ill. I do not think I have to remind the Congress or the people of our country that seven or eight million people are afflicted with arthritis or rheumatism and are unable to work because of those crippling diseases.

I do not think I have to remind the Congress or the people of our country that over 20 million people are affected in one way or another through some neurological disorder; and many of the answers are not yet known to us.

Those are some of the reason I have an interest in these programs and have had for the past 8 years. They are the reasons I have appeared before you year after year, asking for adequate appropriations in these fields of disease because I earnestly believe that we are going to find the answers; that we are on the right road, we are on the right track, and every dollar we are spending in research in this field is going to pay off in the end.

I am very happy to report that the committee this year put back some of the cuts that were made by the Bureau

of the Budget in cancer and heart. And I am very happy that they also supplied and additional \$750,000 for research into the new substance called glutamine, so that a year from now we may have the answer, a definite answer, as far as a cure or a control of epilepsy is concerned—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

(Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to proceed for an additional 2 minutes.)

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, if we do, the \$750,000 will be well spent.

I thought we were doing something for the blind, but during the hearings I found out from Dr. Bailey of the Neurology and Blindness Institute that we were doing very little for the blind. Our committee very graciously, I think, appropriated an additional \$400,000 for that institute for research in blindness. Some of the leads they have on blindness today I think will pay off. They think they have the answer today as to why some premature babies are afflicted with blindness immediately after birth. If they have that answer, that \$400,000 will be well spent.

However, I do not think we have gone far enough. I hope that tomorrow, with the cooperation of my chairman and our committee, we will be able to increase the funds for research in heart, in cancer, in mental health, and in neurology and blindness. If we do that, I think we can go to the American people and justify a vote on the ground that we are not only helping ourselves but we are helping every person who is alive today and those who are unborn at the present time.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I want to salute the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island for the remarkable statement he has just presented to the Committee. No matter what he is able to accomplish in the House of Representatives in the days to come, I think what he has already done in promoting Federal medical research will stand as an everlasting tribute to his services in this body.

He has said several times on the floor of the House today that he was not here a year ago when they had a conference between the two Houses on this appropriation bill carrying funds for the fiscal year 1954. I happen to know why he was not here. It was because he became ill and had to go out to Bethesda, because of the very work that he did on this bill, particularly in his plea to stand for the funds for Federal research recommended by the administration. I say all of us here in the House and the people of the United States owe him an everlasting debt of gratitude.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I take these few minutes to commend the able and distinguished Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the fine job she has done and to commend the hard

working and outstanding members of this subcommittee, under the very worthy leadership of my genial friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY], on doing a magnificent job on a very difficult bill. I understand there is very slight disagreement between the Members on both sides of the aisle with reference to this subject matter, and it covers many, many items.

I am going to say something that I have said privately a good many times to my friends, and that concerns the able chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY]. I do not think any man in this House has assumed and shouldered responsibility with any deeper sense of humility than has he. He certainly has grown to the task, and he has done a splendid job. Of course, he had a wonderful teacher. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is able to teach us all. But still the gentleman from Illinois has really done an outstanding job and we are all proud of it. So, I say to you, although there may be a few items in disagreement, in principle the committee is to be commended. When you take this bill and realize what it really is—you will find between 80 percent and 85 percent and perhaps 87 percent consists of items that you cannot touch, such as matching funds and health and research funds. Who is going to cut them? So the leeway on this bill so far as cutting is concerned is practically nil. I think our able Secretary, and I must say to the membership of the House that I have known the gentlelady for some 25 years—we come from the same town in Texas and I have known her family and I have known her—during World War II she headed a great organization of the women in the Army known as the WACS—as I was saying our able Secretary has had a wealth of administrative experience in the last 20 years that few women in this country have had. She has made an outstanding success in the business world. She and her husband bought a paper some 15 or 18 years ago, and it is now one of the largest papers in my home State of Texas. Frankly, she is an excellent business woman. She has made money and has brought success to her own enterprises, and she is going to bring some of that good, common horse sense and business judgment and acumen to your business and the business of the Federal Government. I do hope if there should be any misunderstanding between the Secretary and my colleagues on the committee, that that misunderstanding is only temporary. I understand there is some dispute about an item in the chart room. Frankly, I think \$100,000 would buy a lot of charts. But, if you look into it, you will find that it boils down so far as that item is concerned that it did not get out of hand, she had a pretty good idea in mind as to what she wanted and I will venture the assertion that through the years, it will pay off and she will save money. I notice that after being in office for 12 or 18 months at the most, she has reduced the overall budget for that agency with all of its ramifications since 1953 approximately \$200 million or

\$225 million, and yet in the face of that reduction there has been a tremendous reorganization going on within her agencies. If you analyze it, I think some new duties have been added, and, if not, certainly some of the old ones have been expanded. I think she is doing a fine job and I also think the committee has done a fine job. I wish each of you a lot of good luck and a lot of cooperation. There should be nothing partisan in this bill.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say this bill deals with people and their health, education, and welfare. I think the bill is in good hands. I do not know what the action will be tomorrow. However, I do want to say this on behalf of my colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], I listened to him in the full committee on last Friday and he spoke completely without notes, as he did today. I think he is performing a public service in his study and in his presentation of some of these things which are new in medicine, which may mean so much to ourselves and to our posterity.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to have 3 minutes of the time on my side at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I am taking this time to reply to my genial friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], concerning the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

First, I share his opinion concerning her ability as an administrator. I think she is a good administrator. Reference to the \$100,000 chartroom was not, necessarily, condemnation of the chartroom as such. Perhaps the chartroom was a good thing. The committee felt, however, that the committee and the Congress should take action in advance to provide funds for these activities, rather than being told, after the fact, what had been done with the Department's funds. I think that same reasoning should apply for all agencies of Government that make requests that are considered by appropriations subcommittees, such as the subcommittee of which the gentleman from Texas was, for several years, the chairman. We do not challenge her right under the law to do what has been done.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

BILL TO RAISE INTEREST RATES ON THE FARMERS SHOULD BE RECOMMITTED

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to H. R. 8656, authorizing the Department of Agriculture to raise the maximum interest rate on farm ownership loans made under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act from 4 percent to 5 percent, which has recently been favorably reported by the Committee on Agriculture.

I was greatly surprised to find my good friends on the Agriculture Committee—watchdogs for the depressed farmers of this Nation, and who have so often demonstrated that they are real, genuine friends of the farmer—permitting this "sleeper" bill to be put through. We all are aware that farm prices have declined 16 percent to 17 percent, and that farm income has been hard hit. We also know that this administration is continuing its unremitting pressure on farm prices in the hopes of capturing a few city votes by lowering support prices wherever it can by advocating flexible farm support prices and selling surplus Commodity Credit Corporation stocks regardless of the market effect.

No group in this country needs protection from unnecessary added financial burdens more at this time than the farmers who have been put through the wringer by this administration. Moreover, Members of Congress must realize upon consideration, that this proposal to impose so-called variable interest rates on farm ownership loans is out of date, out of fashion, and out of favor.

The Senate version of this bill was passed a year ago. The Senate Agriculture Committee reported the bill June 30, 1953. It was still fashionable to raise interest rates at that time. Humphrey, Burgess, and Martin were whooping it up for higher rates. Commodity Credit Corporation had boosted interest rates on farm price-support loans. Burgess had forced through an increase in interest rates on Export-Import Bank loans, although it was returning a handsome profit to the Treasury; FHA- and VA-backed home-mortgage interest rates had been boosted by one-fourth and one-half percent. But times have changed since last June. The rates that were raised last year should be reduced. The arguments that were used then to get the interest-rate increases apply now in favor of their reduction.

The fact that unnecessary interest boosting is out of style today is demonstrated by the action of the House and the Senate, in their consideration of the new housing bill. They have rejected the flexible interest-rate provision requested by the administration.

ONE PERCENT INCREASE ON HOUSING LOANS DEFEATED

On April 2, 1954, the housing bill was before the House of Representatives for consideration. I offered an amendment to strike out all of title II, as indicated at page 4178 of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date. This title, if left in the bill, would have permitted interest rates to have been raised by 1 percent, and my amendment was to strike out title II and thereby prevent the raising of interest rates by 1 percent.

The debate continued from page 4178 to page 4189. A number of Members spoke in favor of this amendment, particularly members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs who were strongly opposed to it. The vote was taken and, as indicated at page 4189 of the RECORD of that date, the ayes were 141 and nays 68. The amendment was agreed to by more than a 2 to 1 vote. It is my understanding that the Senate committee

likewise eliminated the provision in the Senate bill which would have raised interest rates 1 percent after the decisive vote in the House against it. It now appears that since all other attempts to increase interest rates have failed, this last attempt is made to increase the rate on the farmers.

FORTY DOLLARS PER CAPITA INCREASE CAUSED BY 1-PERCENT RAISE

A 1-percent increase seems small, but when you apply it clear across the board on all debts, the amount is enormous. For instance, there are \$640 billion in debts, public and private. A 1-percent increase in interest on this amount would be \$6,400 million a year. Divide that by 160 million people, and it is discovered that it is \$40 per capita per year. When you consider that a family of five will have to rearrange their former budget each year hereafter, in order to take care of that 1-percent increase in interest rates, it means that this family of five will have to reduce its expenditures by \$200 for comforts and necessities of life, in order to have the \$200 available to provide for this new 1-percent interest charge. In other words, it will divert \$200 each year from the expenditures of the average family of five from food, clothing, automobiles, appliances, and other worthwhile conveniences and necessities to the payment of \$200 to the moneylenders. Interest increases upsets and unbalances all budgets, public and private. This is supplementing the trickle-down theory. If the family of five spends the \$200 for ordinary expenses it will go into the bloodstream of business and will help everybody, as dollars have velocity and turn over several times a year—unless they reach hands that do not need to spend them. The moneylenders will not need the money as much as the family paying the money for interest, so the constructive aid of this money to our economy is slowed down, retarded, and in some cases absolutely stopped. It will only be helpful to the extent that it trickles down from those who need it the least, or do not need it at all, into the hands of those who will spend it for necessities of life and for other purposes.

The word "flexible" has been used as indicating, in connection with money, a higher interest rate. In other words, a flexible rate means a higher rate. In the case of the farmers a flexible price means a lower price. This particular bill H. R. 8656, for some unknown reason uses a new word. It is "variable." In other words, the bill provides for a variable interest rate. In this case, it has the same effect that the word "flexible" has and will mean higher interest to the farmer.

If the members of the Agriculture Committee believe that the interest rate boost will increase the flow of private money into farm-ownership loans they should recall our experience with FHA and VA loans in the spring and summer of 1953.

When the rate of interest was increased the annual rate of housing starts fell. It dropped 200,000 from February 1953 to September 1953. Having won one increase in interest rates, lenders

expected more, and withheld their money in the hope further increases would be forthcoming. Indecision was increased and not decreased.

Mr. Chairman, this is no time to unnecessarily increase the interest burden of farmers.

IF MORE FUNDS ARE NEEDED

If more funds are needed under the Bankhead-Jones farm-tenant program, and private lenders, with hundreds of millions lying idle, are refusing to make the loans even with Government insurance, then our problem is one of moving money into the program, and it should be done in the simple, direct way available to us, by authorizing more Federal loans. It will not be necessary for the Government to make such loans. The fact that they are authorized will break the money lenders strike.

I shall oppose any effort to bribe private lenders into the farm-ownership loan field by increasing the burden of the farmer borrower through raising his interest rates.

Instead of authorizing increased interest on farm debt, this Congress should be studying how to reduce farmers' debt burdens.

RECENT FARM STUDY DISCLOSES HIGH INTEREST

My attention was recently directed to a study of Agricultural Credit Through Commercial Banks, issued by the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City in April 1954.

This study revealed that the farmers surveyed were paying up to 12 percent interest for money. Forty-four percent of all their notes were at 8 percent interest. Another 15 percent of notes drew 7 percent interest and 37 percent of notes were at 6 percent interest. The farmers interviewed were paying 6 to 8 percent interest on more than 90 percent of all the money they had borrowed.

The only persons who appeared in favor of this bill, according to the transcript of the record, were the witnesses from the Department of Agriculture. It was a brief, routine hearing. I find no testimony in the hearing about the current monetary situation. I find no discussion of alternative sources of funds. I find no discussion of the financial situation of farmers.

No one was informed that the interest-boosting team of Humphrey, Burgess, and Martin, who were riding high at the time this increase in interest rates was first suggested and passed by the Senate, have recently reversed their field—at least until the recession subsides—and are now extolling the merits of low interest rates.

In all good humor, I would like to suggest to my friends on the Agriculture Committee that they, themselves, recapture this bill for reconsideration and get a little up-to-date information about the necessity for heaping this additional straw on the backs of the farmers.

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS].

(Mr. MATTHEWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, the bill that we are now considering, H. R. 9447, is what we might call the bill which provides for domestic security, because in this bill we are considering appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and other related dependent agencies which touch the heartbeat of America. In view of the enormous expenditures for defense, I have consistently maintained that the expenditures for the domestic economy should not be curtailed when such expenditures are necessary for the welfare of our people. The appropriations in this bill which we are considering touch every facet of life in the Eighth Congressional District of Florida and in every other district in the United States. Let us consider for a few moments the program of vocational education. This pragmatic approach to education has paid many times over for the money we have spent. I am thinking in particular about vocational agriculture. My own State of Florida at the present time is putting up approximately \$7 for every dollar of Federal money. A very conservative estimate of our needs at the present time is 25 additional teachers. There is one agriculture teacher in my district who has over 100 boys enrolled in his class. Besides teaching these boys, he is needed for doing work with the young farmers and adult farmers in organized group instruction. Although the Committee on Appropriations which reported this bill—and which has done excellent work—has matched the appropriation of last year, I maintain that the appropriation should be increased. It has been estimated that throughout the country we have at the present time only about 50 percent of the needs of our high-school students met through the overall program of vocational education.

Let us consider the appropriation for vocational rehabilitation. The current appropriation for vocational rehabilitation in the States is \$23 million. Between 60,000 and 65,000 persons are being rehabilitated annually. When the 1954 appropriation was in conference, restrictive language was added as follows:

Provided further, That the amount apportioned to a State for fiscal year 1955 shall not exceed \$1 for each 75 cents contributed by the State for the same purpose.

The item was not in either the House or Senate bill, and was not mentioned in the conference report. Since legislatures in 35 States have not met this year, they have had no opportunity to replace lost Federal funds with State funds. If the restrictive language is not stricken out of the appropriation act, it is true that only about \$19 million, the amount provided for by the bill, could be spent. However, there is a desperate need for an increase in appropriation. I hope this amount can be raised to a minimum of \$23 million, which was the amount available for 1954, and at the same time I hope that the restrictive language can be taken out.

Let me show you what this restrictive language means to us in Florida. For some years, I was the honorary chairman of the Florida Council for the Blind, an

organization engaged in the vocational rehabilitation of those in Florida who have defective vision and those who are totally blind. In 1953, the Florida Council for the Blind placed 237 persons in employment and contacted 7,625 persons for vocational purposes. Under their auspices 1,236 examinations were completed and hundreds of eye surgeries performed. One of the most important programs of the Florida Council for the Blind is its vending stand program of small retail units located in post offices, courthouses, city halls and other public and private buildings throughout Florida. The 70 full-time blind vending-stand operators paid income tax totaling \$8,584.95 in 1952. The stands in sales taxes paid into the State treasury the sum of \$4,135.32 during the same year. Now if the 70 blind operators of these vending stands had not been employed, they would have drawn in aid to the blind payments, for the fiscal year 1953 figured at the average grant, the total sum of \$38,120. Instead, they earned from their gainful employment \$132,709 in wages. In fiscal 1953, 1,500 blind vending-stand operators and their 2,316 employees in the United States earned in excess of \$4.5 million. Now this program of vocational rehabilitation is economically and morally sound and every possible step should be taken to guaranty its progress. If the restrictive language in this appropriation bill remains, it will cost this one agency in Florida \$95,000 in Federal funds.

It should be pointed out here the relationships between the State and Federal Governments. Some may say, "Well, the State should assume more of this burden"; and yet I believe that until some definite step is taken in the establishment of a specific ratio of cost between the State and Federal Governments, that this program must not suffer. We should certainly keep the program at least on its present level of effectiveness. In Florida at the beginning of the biennium, July 1, 1951, a total of 3,117 handicapped persons were enrolled for vocational rehabilitation services. During the biennium, 8,191 cases of handicapped persons were processed and the number of those who succeeded in completing their rehabilitation and were employed were 3,010. Now 365 of these persons were receiving public assistance when service began at an annual cost of \$265,000—or \$530,000 during the biennium. Every effort is made to provide rehabilitation service before the applicant is forced to go on relief. The average weekly wage of these persons after rehabilitation, exclusive of the farmers and housewives, was \$37.42. The total annual earnings of rehabilitated persons, exclusive of the farmers and housewives, were \$4,808,284 or \$9,616,568 for the biennium. The annual income-tax payments of the 3,010 persons rehabilitated is estimated at \$329,000. The total expenditure for vocational rehabilitation for the biennium was \$1,580,949. It has been estimated that throughout the United States 2 million persons who are now unemployed because of disability could be made employable through vocational rehabilita-

tion services. I hope that the House will take action not to decrease the strength of this program, but to make it stronger and more effective.

Now let us turn to the great program of the public health service. I think that the contributions of the Federal Government have given a tremendous incentive to our various States to promote their magnificent health services. I say again that until we have some definite understanding of the cost that should be borne by the State and Federal Governments respectively that we should not decrease our contributions in the field of public health service. There has been a reduction of \$2 million in the appropriation for venereal disease control. These diseases are highly communicable. Because of the mobility of our population they spread very rapidly. Syphilis is a serious disease that cripples and kills. The last available statistics I have on the problem of venereal disease control are for the fiscal year 1953. In that year the statistics show in at least 25 of our States there was an increase in venereal disease case rates over the previous year. I repeat again this is no time to reduce this program of control and eradication.

I am delighted that the committee did not reduce the appropriations for tuberculosis. Several weeks ago I wrote the chairman of the subcommittee about the dozens of letters to me from interested citizens all over Florida requesting that the appropriations for tuberculosis be maintained at their present level. The Florida death rate in 1953 for tuberculosis was only one-fifth of what it was in 1940. The Florida Tuberculosis and Health Association has done an excellent job in operating its mobile X-ray units which give free X-rays to people who otherwise could not afford it. They have examined 400,000 persons over a period of about 8 years. The tuberculosis cut for the year ending June 30, 1954, was \$83,900 and the proposed cut for the year ending June 30, 1955, would have been \$35,000 if the funds had not been restored as a result of the subcommittee's action. If this cut had become effective, it would have meant that all but one X-ray unit would have been discontinued and there would have also been a reduction in technicians, clerical workers and statisticians.

Let us take the proposed grants for hospital construction. I have maintained before on the floor of the House that I am opposed to socialized medicine, but I insist that we must continue to make progress in solving our medical problems. One of the things that we need desperately is more opportunities for medical education. I have pointed out in previous talks that on the campus of the University of Florida in Gainesville which is in my home district, we are at present building a great Florida health center. We need a hospital to service our medical school in order that our young men and women might receive a medical education. This problem is current throughout the whole United States. It is in my opinion a proper responsibility of the Federal Government to help in this type of hospital construction. The Florida State Improve-

ment Commission has sent me a list of the various communities in my Eighth Congressional District of Florida who are contemplating building necessary hospitals or health centers through the Federal grant-in-aid programs. Our people need these hospitals desperately and we should make every effort to see that, based on sound business principles and with proper regard to Federal and State relationships, we build these hospitals to help our people.

I notice that the grants to States for public assistance have been decreased approximately \$200 million. This is due to the expiration of the McFarland amendment which by its own terms is supposed to expire on September 30, 1954. The law up to that time provided for a Federal contribution to these programs of three-fourths of the amount paid to the recipient up to \$25 and one-half of such amount as exceeded \$25 to a maximum of \$50 to each recipient. The McFarland amendment provides for an increase of Federal participation to four-fifths of the first \$25 and one-half of the excess over \$25 to a maximum of \$55 to each recipient. Anticipating the continuation of the Federal participation on the basis of the McFarland amendment, the Florida Legislature appropriated for the public-assistance programs for the biennium beginning July 1, 1953, sufficient money to carry on the present program. Therefore, unless the McFarland amendment is reenacted prior to September 30, 1954, Florida will receive approximately \$6,750,000 less in Federal matching funds for this program than has been budgeted for the current biennium. This would mean that it will be necessary to reduce old-age assistance payments an average of \$9.75 per month, aid to dependent children \$3.70 a month and aid to the blind \$3.50 a month.

Now once again we come to the problem of just how much of the cost for the old-age assistance is our Federal Government to assume and how much of the cost is the State government to assume? Whatever happens, I do not think our old citizens, our dependent children, and our blind should have any reduction in their benefits. Certainly this McFarland amendment should remain in the law until the various State legislatures are notified of the specific intention of Congress to change that provision in future appropriations. If this be the will of the Congress, the respective States will then have an opportunity to supplement their appropriations so that our dependent citizens getting assistance will not find their meager benefits reduced.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I want to congratulate the members of the committee. I know that they have labored long and hard and are vitally concerned with the great programs for which this bill provides. I want to stress again that I do not believe a single one of these programs should have its effectiveness curtailed. I think each of them has proved its value. I think each of them is necessary to the internal security of this Nation. I hope we can liberalize certain of these appropriations as I have indicated in this talk.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ].

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I want to join my good chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY], and the Members of the House here today in commending the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] for the excellent job he has done in the committee and that he did here today.

At the beginning of this debate I told the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] that I was going to relinquish any time I might be entitled to as a member of the subcommittee because it was my opinion that he knew more about this subject than any other member of the committee. He has done a magnificent job.

I want to join, also, with the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] in commending our chairman for his fairness and for the fine cooperation which he gave to all members of the subcommittee. We are all very happy and I think we have come here with a good bill, a fair bill, and if we can make it even a little more adequate tomorrow we will be still happier. I want to associate myself with the views of my good friend and colleague from Rhode Island in respect to the various proposed increases.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, on tomorrow I expect to offer an amendment increasing the appropriation for vocational education over the amount available this year by \$5 million, which will make a total of \$23,672,261.

For several years now a number of us here have been interested in the progress of vocational education throughout the Nation. Boosted by the George-Barden Act passed in 1946, this program has taken on new proportions, mostly as a result of determined support from within the States and localities. Under the provisions of the George-Barden Act there was an authorization for the annual appropriation of \$29,300,000 for vocational education. It was the intent of those who worked on this legislation that ultimately the full amount would be made available each year as a stimulant to this program.

Vocational education since its inception in 1917 has received its strength from a cooperative plan of Federal, State, and local financing. One of the commendable features of this program is that it is decidedly void of any real Federal interference. Each of the States and Territories submit their own plans, devised by persons within the States. These plans are then jointly agreed upon by the States and the United States Office of Education. The Federal Government's participation is a small, but important part of this overall program. It has been my experience that wherever there is any real discussion of the work of vocational education it is on a highly constructive plane. I recall vividly that a year ago we here in the House undertook to restore cuts which had been made in the vocational education program, first by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and later by the Appropriations Committee. The resulting debate produced as I recall it not one

single word of criticism of the work of vocational education. I believe this is generally true because it has been my experience that the people connected with vocational education have formulated and operated a program of vocational education which is constructive and valuable in our society.

Vocational education is not a small operation. The Federal participation is not a large participation. I believe we can safely say that as many people are directly concerned with vocational education dollar for dollar as with any of the Federal-State programs which we foster. The annual appropriation of less than \$20 million under the George-Barden Act is money well spent. We in this country are fortunate in being the greatest producing Nation on earth. We produce in this country approximately 42 percent of all of the goods produced in the world with a population of less than 7 percent of the total in the world. We are a growing Nation and our needs continue to expand as we assume larger responsibilities. Each year thousands of workers leave farms. They need to be replaced by others growing into manhood. Vocational agriculture has played a tremendous roll in aiding this country in the enlarging of its farm potential.

Industrially we are growing by leaps and bounds and the vocational education program in the field of trades and industries is playing a vital roll in training future personnel.

Distributive education, one of the backbones of the vocational education program, is each year preparing young people for the field of retailing.

Home economics with its emphasis upon better application of methods in the home is playing a responsible role in equipping our homes with better homemakers.

We are many times apt to lose sight of the work being accomplished by emphasizing too largely the amount of money going into a program. I want to emphasize as hard as I know how that the amount of money expended for any particular program does not of itself assure success. Neither does the amount of money expended indicate in any measure whatsoever the long-range potentialities embodied in the program. Just for the record, however, let me say that in 1953 the program of vocational education throughout the Nation cost a total of \$145,951,214 and served 3,100,139 persons. By pointing out that of this total, only \$25,366,459 was Federal aid we can see graphically that the States and localities are exercising the utmost faith in a program which we here helped to expand by an initial Federal assistance under the George-Barden Act.

During 1953, local governments throughout the country provided \$68,366,164 for vocational education and State governments added \$52,217,589. This is evidence of determination on the part of our people to grasp the opportunity offered by Federal assistance and make the utmost out of it. The program is well rounded. It includes people in every State in the Nation under four categories of instruction—755,293 students in vocational agriculture;

1,327,285 in home economics; 249,012 in distributive education; and 808,549 in trades and industries.

No program anywhere in our Nation has by the expenditure of such comparatively small amounts delivered so much in return. Figures for 1952 show that the average expenditure per pupil throughout the country was \$46.26, of which only \$8.17 was Federal aid. Federal assistance under this program has been more than the mere appropriation of funds, although this has been extremely important. Federal assistance has meant the establishment of certain standards which have brought to this field a greater degree of efficiency of operation than has been enjoyed by many similar enterprises.

We judge most things by the results we see from them. Down on the farm, if we plant a little seed and reap a good harvest we are always satisfied. Several years ago we planted a seed of promise by the adoption of the George-Barden Act establishing a foundation on which has now grown a larger operation than we had ever imagined. We established this program by the guaranty of Federal assistance because I presume we believed in the fundamental aspect of vocational education. The basis of our beliefs had been encouraged through the years since 1917 when the Smith-Hughes Act was passed by the Congress. We in effect said to the States "We will go along with you in setting up the program, in establishing standards and formulating plans and then wait and see how far you as States and localities can go toward building upon that foundation."

I believe that the result has been encouraging to us all. Vocational education has grown and our respect for it has similarly been enlarged.

At the appropriate time I plan to introduce an amendment to the appropriation bill calling for an increase in the amount allotted to vocational education. By so doing, I want to demonstrate my personal faith in the program. I hope that we recognize that with the enlarged program which has been adopted, with the greater need which has arisen and with the shortage of teachers which exists, there is a necessity for a larger expenditure of money if we are to obtain the benefits which can be ours. The bill as written provides an expenditure of \$18,374,511 for vocational education under the George-Barden Act. This is a reduction of \$298,750 under the amount appropriated a year ago. I realize that it has been pointed out that this is the same amount which was spent in fiscal 1954. However, I would like to remind my colleagues that one of the basic fundamentals of the George-Barden Act provides for the proper apportioning of funds to the States to be used specifically for the categories set forth. This is the only just way in which to make the money available, inasmuch as each of the States should be given opportunity to use the funds which are allocated for them while maintaining a balanced program. If we are to adopt the practice of each year appropriating only the amount that was spent in the previous year then we will systematically cut this

appropriation annually from here on out. The simple truth is that when money is appropriated and allocated on a basis such as this all funds cannot be spent within the specific allocations until a program is adopted within the State. If we adopt such a practice we are in effect encouraging States to spend money whether they have a good use for it or not in order that the appropriation may be preserved.

I plan to offer an amendment which would increase the appropriation for vocational education for fiscal 1955 by \$5 million over the amount made available in 1954. This would be a total of \$23,673,261 compared with \$18,673,261 which has been appropriated in each of the last 2 years. I would like to remind my colleagues that should we approve such an inducement for larger expansion of this program we will then be making available a total sum \$6 million less than was the intent of the George-Barden Act adopted in 1946.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEAL].

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I have been very greatly interested in the discussion this afternoon. Naturally the things that have been brought out here are along my line, as a doctor of medicine, having spent a good many years following through and watching the progress of medicine and research and the investigation of matters pertaining to general health. It is interesting to me to see that the Members of Congress understand the problems before them as well as they do, and to see that the committee, through its chairman and through its Representatives on the opposite side, including the gentleman from Rhode Island, has such a thorough knowledge of these situations is really very gratifying to me.

It has been a long time since old Colonel Gorgas handled the problem of the construction of the Panama Canal with malaria to contend with. However, that was the beginning, we may say, of what we now call the Public Health Service. At that time it was recognized that there were a lot of things to be done in connection with the prevention and control of disease that needed help from one source to another. I would say that was about the first of the Government's activity in health matters. To know that organization has spread its influence in forty or fifty different courses, and to know that the work has been recognized as a governmental or Federal responsibility, is well worthwhile. I think all Members of Congress should be commended for their activities along that line.

Let us take this one fact into consideration and recognize that, long before the Federal Government entered into the contributions that we now allocate for the control and the research of various diseases, there was a very concerted and coordinated activity among the members of the medical profession, among the manufacturers of pharmaceuticals, among the big chemical organizations, among the manufacturers of X-ray and various other equipment—all

combining their efforts in trying to bring about a better and more thorough understanding of the basic knowledge of diseases as matters in which they might be interested.

Now, these things have been done purely on a coordinated voluntary basis, and while I know that the Government deserves a great deal of credit for the things that we are advocating today, I feel that we must recognize the fact that we, as a government, are only accepting and attempting to allocate some funds in order to improve and encourage the thing that started many generations ago and which is progressive year after year. I fully recognize the fact that all of these chronic diseases have a great many hidden basic causes which, through this experimentation and research, will eventually help to bring to us a better understanding so that we may be able to combat them to a greater extent. But, let us not forget that, as the years go by, human beings being only examples of progressive life, many of the things cannot be eliminated, in spite of the knowledge we have and that we are able to acquire as to the cause. We will always have these things to contend with. The better we prepare ourselves to meet the conditions, the better our people will be. I personally favor every cent of appropriations that has been made in any manner toward the prevention, toward the control, toward the research, and toward the development of ways and means of controlling diseases among all our people.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, few programs contribute so much to the agricultural and industrial might of our country for a relatively modest expenditure of public funds. Vocational education is a sound investment in the future of thousands of boys and girls who leave our high schools each year to go directly into trades and industry, farming, and homemaking.

My own experience has been primarily in the field of agriculture and I have seen firsthand just how successful this program is in Minnesota. And there can be no better testimony to the enthusiasm of farm families than the rapidly increasing enrollment in vocational agriculture courses in every part of our country.

Agriculture is being revolutionized every year. Every day our scientists and our great research stations are making new advances in farm methods and in farm products. Mechanization continues to increase, demanding new skills and new experience for the farm worker.

There is no better way to bring the know-how from the laboratory to the farm than by training young men and women while they are in our school system. Farming is a highly complex enterprise requiring scientific knowledge and mechanical skills that even our fathers did not need to have in order to carry on their operations.

It is of benefit to the entire Nation to train younger farmers to take advantage of the improved methods and new materials being developed by our research and experiment facilities.

I do not need to remind you that this House a short time ago saw fit to increase the funds for the research and extension activities of the Department of Agriculture. The overwhelming support for these appropriations indicates the widespread support for continuing the gains we have made in efficient and productive farming.

But this information must be put to work on the farm and there is no better way to do that than through our established educational systems. The cooperation of the local school districts attests to the importance farmers themselves place up this program.

It is true that the very abundance of our production has given rise to new problems in agriculture today. But with our population growing at an unprecedented rate, these problems are temporary and we will soon be called upon to feed a fifth person for every four we feed today.

That means that if fewer farmers are going to continue to feed more people at less cost, we need to help the farm family keep abreast of new and better practices in farming. And even now, in this period of accumulating surpluses, we need to continue to improve the methods of producing quality farm products and to take advantage of better marketing procedures.

Why not bring this information to young farmers through our schools at a time when they are preparing themselves for their life's work?

I speak of agriculture because I know it best. But everything I have said about vocational agriculture applies as well to the other phases of this program—trades and industry, distributive occupations, and home economics.

Our military leaders complain that so much time must be spent in training young men in the multiplicity of skills needed in modern armies. Why not teach these skills to young men in their schools? They are the same skills needed in our factories and in our trades.

Our security in these hazardous times depends to a great extent upon our industrial and agricultural capacity. More than ever, trained workers are an integral part of the line of defense. And again, vocational education in our schools is the best training ground for these skilled workers. This is the economical way to meet the problem.

Federal, State, and local cooperation is the way to meet the problem. This is the traditional way in which Americans have worked together for the benefit of all.

The benefit to our national security and national defense is readily apparent. But other benefits to the individual and to the community are as compelling a reason for continuing a sound program of vocational education.

The young men and women who are trained in their occupations are ready

to take their place in the community without wasted years of confusion and indecision. They are prepared to go into the trades and businesses so vital to the healthy development of the community and to the stability of the people who make their homes there.

The trades and business of the community benefit from a ready source of skilled and trained workers who know what they want to do and how to do it.

Because the benefits are so widespread, the people in every community and State are anxious to expand the program and give this wonderful opportunity to more children. Surely when they are increasing their efforts is no time for the Federal Government to decrease its contribution.

In my own State of Minnesota, local people provided \$1,376,397.78 for vocational education in 1953. During the same year, the State of Minnesota spent another \$1,252,601.58 for vocational education. The Federal contribution was only about one-fifth of the amount the people of Minnesota themselves paid \$571,955.22.

This should demonstrate beyond a doubt that the people of Minnesota regard vocational education as essential to the education of their children. And the same is true for the other States, for each dollar in Federal funds there are \$5 in State and local funds spent for the program.

Even while the States are trying to expand their programs, our population continues to grow at a terrific pace of 300 new persons every hour. All of these children will come into our schools and will eventually leave them to find a place in an economy that needs to grow with our population.

In return for the benefits which are common to all of us, the Federal contribution to this program is certainly not unreasonable nor extravagant. I urge, therefore, that we increase funds for this program. It is sound economy to prepare for the future. Does any one know a better way than to give to people the skills to work to live in a complex society?

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, a little more than a century ago, Dr. Ephriam McDowell performed a successful operation down in Kentucky that marked a new era in medical science. He successfully used an anesthetic on a patient during a very difficult operation although the effective use of anesthetics had not previously been considered possible. Since that time we have seen spectacular scientific developments in other fields, with transportation and communication getting the most attention, climaxed by the atomic and hydrogen bombs. In the meantime, medical research continued on an ever-increasing scale.

Modern medical science really began with Harvey who discovered the circulation of the blood. The next great step was Pasteur's accomplishments. Research facilities were scarce and progress depended on the sacrifice of a few humanitarian individuals who oftentimes neglected their own interests in order to promote the science of medicine. On this basis, the progress was as good as could be expected but only in the last half century, with the development of the Public Health Service, has real progress been made.

These developments, though less spectacular, will probably be recorded in history as more important than the atom bomb, television, or any of the great scientific accomplishments of our time. Through the efforts of the Public Health Service, in cooperation with medical science, diseases such as smallpox, tuberculosis, and the killers dreaded by our forefathers have all but been eliminated. This could have been accomplished in so short a time only when the necessary research was financed, at least in part, by public funds. Tuberculosis has ceased to be a dreaded word and is becoming much less common. We have not only learned how to arrest it when it finds a victim, but we have gone far toward curtailing its spread and reducing the number of victims.

Today the No. 1 killer is heart disease, followed closely by cancer. The ordinary life expectancy has been increased so that the average person may reasonably expect to attain the age of three score and ten. The rate of infant mortality has been phenomenally reduced and this, in itself, is an accomplishment which more than justifies all the expenditures that this Government has made on its public-health program.

Today this great service continues its efforts to improve the health of our population. Vast research projects have been established. The National Institute of Health works in cooperation with more than 6,500 practitioners assembling and analyzing information on a scale far beyond the possibilities of the old independent practitioners' resources.

We all agree that this has been a good program and that it should be continued. Last year this body reduced the funds for some of the most important aspects of this program. Today we are asked to make certain other reductions, including a \$10 million reduction in the funds requested for the building of hospitals. The funds proposed for the control and treatment of tuberculosis have been reduced, and the bill reported by the committee provides for no increase over that of the current year. The population increases year by year, but we find a failure to increase the funds for the protection of the health of this growing population. There should be a substantial increase in the funds for the treatment and control of tuberculosis patients.

For the No. 1 killer of today, heart disease, we find that the committee has recommended no more than the amount appropriated this year. This recommendation is made in the face of testimony of representatives of the National

Heart Committee justifying an annual appropriation of \$29,900,000, 80 percent of which is to go for research and research facilities. The committee has recommended instead \$15,168,000 or approximately half of what this learned group of national public-spirited citizens and specialists feel is a minimum requirement.

The cancer research program has been given similar consideration. There has been no decrease in the cost of such undertaking, and there has been an increase in the population to be protected by the public health program.

Facing these facts, how can we tell the folks back home that they do not need as much or that this Government cannot afford to provide funds to protect them from the hazards of ill health and disease.

The overall total appropriated for the Public Health Service, exclusive of administrative expenses and St. Elizabeths Hospital, in 1954 was \$232,962,500. The committee recommendations include a total of \$209,815,000. This reduction of more than \$23 million is approximately equal to the amount deleted for hospital construction and construction of research facilities. Two other major items are a reduction of \$2 million in the venereal-disease program and \$700,000 in communicable diseases. The need for economy, urgent as it is, cannot justify a curtailment of the program to provide hospitals for a substantial portion of our population.

The cold facts are that our population is increasing rapidly and we are failing to increase the appropriations to meet the increased needs. One of the most tragic shortcomings of our present medical program is the shortage of hospital beds. The Hill-Burton Act was designed and actually sets up a plan to correct this, or at least to alleviate this situation. It is no minor task, and no one Congress has attempted to complete the program so it is up to this Congress to meet its pro rata share of this essential public health project.

Construction costs are not decreasing, and there is no justification for the failure of this session of Congress to make adequate provision to meet the approved projects that are now in the office of Secretary Hobby. The amount of \$65 million in this bill for grants for hospital construction should be increased to the \$75-million figure submitted in the estimates for 1955. The amount of \$15,168,000 for the National Heart Institute should be increased to \$29,888,000, as recommended by the National Heart Committee. The \$20,237,000 for the National Cancer Institute should be increased to \$30 million. The reduction in the amount for venereal diseases from \$5 million to \$3 million should be restored to the full \$5 million for the 1955 program. The \$6 million which is the same as appropriated last year for the tuberculosis program should be increased to \$7,500,000 in line with the needs of an increased population. The \$4,300,000 for the communicable diseases program should be increased to \$5 million, the amount appropriated last year.

I want to read a letter, dated June 3, 1954, from Kentucky's health commissioner, Dr. Bruce Underwood, outlining the effects of limited funds on the State's public health program:

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY,
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
Louisville, Ky., June 3, 1954.
HON. CARL D. PERKINS,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PERKINS: Thank you very much for calling our attention to the fact that the appropriation bill will be on the floor Monday, June 7. I am glad to comply with your request for my views of the effect of this bill on Kentucky's health program, and am taking the liberty of sending copies to other members of the Kentucky delegation. I should like to call your attention also to material previously sent you, which discussed some phases of this matter in more detail.

Total Federal grants-in-aid for public health, exclusive of mental health, in Kentucky are \$255,500 less during the current fiscal year than the amount received for the preceding year. In the face of this 25 percent decrease, we have been able to maintain a minimum of public health services by using increased State appropriations, which were intended for program expansion, to offset the loss of Federal funds. The appropriation bill for fiscal year 1955 will provide for the restoration of approximately one-fifth of the previous cut.

While this restoration is commendable, it will still leave some programs to which grant-in-aid funds have contributed in the past far short of the support which they deserve. Notable examples are those relating to the control of tuberculosis and venereal disease. Federal support of the former in Kentucky decreased by 20 percent from fiscal year 1953 to fiscal year 1954, and if the present recommendation is followed, will decrease by over 50 percent between fiscal years 1954 and 1955. Regular Federal grant-in-aid support for control of venereal disease was eliminated during fiscal year 1954, with the loss of \$67,100 to the State. Between fiscal years 1953 and 1954, special project grants for this purpose were decreased by \$61,286 and to date there is no assurance that any such funds will be available for the next fiscal year. These combined losses of \$219,386 during the biennium will be only slightly offset by the net increase of \$17,100 in general health funds over this same period, as provided in the budget bill.

The tuberculosis problem in Kentucky is of major importance, with provisional figures for 1952 placing us as having the second highest death rate among the 48 States. The venereal disease problem in Kentucky is of an order of magnitude comparable to that in other States, and our own experience shows that the problem is currently increasing. For these reasons, it seems to us particularly regrettable that such drastic curtailment of Federal support in these two fields should have been continued into the next fiscal year.

We are pleased by the President's recommendation for increased funds for the hospital survey and construction program to the 1953 fiscal year level. Provision of adequate hospitalization will do much to enhance our efforts in the control of many diseases, and in the protection of the health of mothers and children. In our opinion the wise expenditure of these funds will have a far-reaching effect on the general improvement of the health of the people of our State.

Assurance of the President's recognition of the value of the Federal-State partnership in public health, as evinced in his recommendation of the continuance of most grants, with actual increase of some, is most

gratifying. With our General Assembly now adjourned for the biennium, it is essential to the continuance of our programs that no reductions whatsoever be made in the recommended amounts to be allocated to the States for public health support during the next fiscal year. Any increases which can be obtained, particularly for the control of tuberculosis and the venereal diseases, will result in provision of needed additional public health services for the people of Kentucky and of the Nation.

We urge your full support of a minimal budget for this purpose as proposed by the President, and will appreciate any efforts which you can make toward securing funds over and above these amounts.

Sincerely,

BRUCE UNDERWOOD, M. D.,
Commissioner of Health.

(Copies to the Kentucky congressional delegation.)

Mr. Chairman, the vocational-education program is also being curtailed by executive action. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare transferred more than a quarter of a million dollars out of the 1954 appropriation for vocational education. This reduction should not only be restored, but the full \$29,300,000 authorized by the George-Barden Act should be appropriated.

I am also deeply interested in the vocational-rehabilitation program. It stems from a sincere desire to see that both Federal and State governments, in a partnership, accept the responsibility and ever-growing challenge of this program to help handicapped people help themselves. The interest of the Federal Government in this program started in 1920. This program, in fact, was among the first established by Congress which involved responsibility for direct services to people. Its development was gradual but rather slow until World War II, but its growth since then has been much more encouraging.

Today when we speak of vocational rehabilitation we include within its scope a comprehensive service which covers a wide variety of medical services, vocational planning, and job placement. We first have the medical examination to determine eligibility, then a period of counseling, and guidance, physical restoration services to remove or lessen disability, training for a job, provision of necessary tools, equipment, and licenses, and selective placement and followup. Today we have 2 million disabled persons who could be rehabilitated under this program. Every year there are 250,000 more new cases. In the 32 years since this vocational-rehabilitation program began only 676,606 men and women have been rehabilitated. The majority of these persons, 466,481 of them, were rehabilitated in the 8 years from 1944 to 1952. At the present rate of the program more than 60,000 are rehabilitated a year. From 1944 to 1953 an average of 52,000 persons were rehabilitated annually. In comparison, from 1920 to 1943 an average of 9,000 were rehabilitated a year.

There are thousands of people throughout this great country of ours who, because of neglected physical disability, are on public welfare rolls. Through the vocational rehabilitation program we have found that it takes far

less to remove people from dependency and make them productive citizens. Earnings of the disabled are increased through vocational rehabilitation. All figures verify the fact that this program is sound from every standpoint. The increased productivity of the communities in which these people live, and their expanded personal spending power plus the amount of increased revenue which resulted for the Federal Government through income taxes, would be sufficient to convince any one of the necessity for more funds. These facts have all been developed in committee and are indisputable.

Then again we must consider the humanitarian angle. Far more important to the handicapped and to me is the fact that human beings have been given an opportunity to help themselves.

To illustrate the cost aspect of this program, Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, at a press conference on March 11, 1954, made this statement:

Each year American taxpayers put up nearly a half billion dollars for public assistance to disabled people, including their dependents, an outlay required as the direct result of the disability of breadwinners.

While not all of the disabled recipients of public assistance could become employable through vocational rehabilitation, experience proves that many can. For example, 12,000 of the 64,000 persons rehabilitated during the 1952 fiscal year were on public assistance rolls or were members of families receiving such assistance.

To maintain these disabled people on assistance for a single year would have cost around \$8.5 million. Their rehabilitation for useful work cost \$6 million.

Now I realize that, in addition to the request for the operation of the vocational rehabilitation program for the fiscal year 1955, Congress is being asked for an estimated \$8 million more to provide for new rehabilitation centers under the hospital construction program. I commend any move to expand this program in order that this Nation can more fully meet its responsibility toward these citizens. I think you have conclusive evidence that this is needed but not at the expense of the currently operating program. This kind of budget cutting can be just as debilitating to the program as the chronic disabilities we are trying to help. There are many improvements that could be and should be made in the present vocational rehabilitation act but budget cutting in this instance is no way to bring them about.

On the basis of these facts, I cannot understand the logic of the budget request from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The request is for \$19,175,000 in grants-in-aid to the States for vocational rehabilitation. Last year's appropriation was \$23 million. The House committee has reported \$21 million for vocational rehabilitation to be disbursed among the States for 1955. This is \$2 million less than the 1954 appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to support an amendment providing more money for vocational rehabilitation. This program has proven its worth as an investment. I feel that it is our duty

to see that the physically handicapped are aided in every way possible to receive this much deserved training so that they can make their just contribution for the welfare of all the country.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, we participate in many historic debates involving many important issues, but none, in my opinion, is of more far-reaching importance than the providing of adequate funds for the advancement of all phases of American education.

During the time allotted to me I should like to address my remarks—not to the overall features of the bill which have been extensively debated—but to the issue of providing adequate funds for vocational education and for vocational rehabilitation.

In the President's message on the state of the Union I was especially impressed by the recommendation of the President for full and adequate funds for these purposes. Yet I later learned that in the President's budget message recommended funds for these purposes were substantially reduced from the amount of moneys previously appropriated for these worthwhile programs.

A disabled veteran or physically handicapped citizen is generally a nonproductive citizen. When rehabilitated they become more productive and useful citizens. Therefore, money spent for rehabilitation and for vocational education is money well spent in that nonproductive citizens may be taken from the tax rolls, and made useful citizens engaged in productive effort created—thus contributing to a healthy economy.

I shall certainly support the amendment to be offered by our colleague, Congressman FOGARTY, to increase the amount of appropriated funds for fiscal 1955 vocational rehabilitation, at least, to the amount available for the current year.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, we should not perpetuate errors heretofore made. It is my information that the restrictive language written into the 1954 appropriation bill, providing that the amount of funds appropriated to a State "shall not exceed \$1 for each 75 cents contributed by the State" for purposes of rehabilitation—was not included in either the House or Senate bills on this subject but that this language was included following the conference on the measure and therefore the matter has not had consideration by the committees of the Congress or adequate consideration by the House.

The restrictive language is not repeated in the pending bill under consideration but will be effective for 1955 and in following years in the event it is not specifically repealed.

I repeat inclusion of this language constituted an error in the first instance and should not be repeated. This restrictive language should be repealed.

To continue the existing rider and by failing to appropriate adequate funds for vocational rehabilitation will mean that the important programs of aids to education will be crippled and curtailed.

I trust that the committee will provide the full funds needed for these purposes and that the important programs of vocational education and vocational rehabilitation will go forward on the Federal-State cooperative basis.

Economy should not be practiced at the expense of education.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER].

(Mr. MILLER of Kansas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the chairman of the Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] and the members of the committee upon the great amount of work that has been done in the drafting of this bill. It was a stupendous undertaking and there is no wonder that there are slight differences of opinion upon some of the many items.

I am of the opinion that the reduction of \$2 million in the appropriation for vocational rehabilitation is not justified, and I shall vote to replace this cut when amendment to that effect is before the House. I shall also oppose the provision that the States be required to appropriate 75 cents for each dollar appropriated by the Federal Government for the reason that at this time it could seriously cripple the program. These are minor deficiencies in the bill that should be corrected.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, social-security legislation has been and will continue to be an integral part of the economic welfare of millions of our citizens.

In other words, as we have become a great industrial Nation the number of people who cannot possibly save enough during the earning years of their life has increased many fold. While social-security benefits do not provide for complete security to those who are eligible they do go far in this direction. This bill, H. R. 9366, will provide greater benefits for those who are eligible. It is apparent that the Ways and Means Committee has given thorough study to the problem; and the recommendation contained in this bill are within the limits of the social-security fund to sustain. For this reason I approve of this section of the bill.

The committee has also seen fit to eliminate those of the medical profession from the bill. This is also a very wise move in my judgment. Doctors, due to the nature of their profession, do not retire; they may and usually do limit their practice in their later years but they seldom retire. For this reason social security would be of little value to them. While there may be some difference of opinion among doctors, the

great majority will be pleased with this provision.

The inclusion of self-employed farmers under social security, however, is a questionable decision. In my own district, which is agricultural as well as industrial, there has been no indication on the part of farmers that they wish to be included. In all fairness, however, I must say that there has been no indication that they do not wish to be included.

The Indiana Farm Bureau, which has a membership of more than 100,000 farm families, brought this question before their members in a series of grassroot meetings last fall. There was no clear-cut sentiment even in this large and representative group of farmers. Since there has been no demand on the part of self-employed farmers to be included under the provisions of social security, it is my judgment that they should have been excluded as the doctors were. If in the future, the sentiment of these farmers should indicate that they wish to be included, then the provisions could be made.

I expect to vote for this bill since under the rule by which it is brought before the House, it cannot be amended. It is my hope that when it is considered by the Senate this particular provision will receive more thorough consideration and that self-employed farmers will not be included at this time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I hope that we can, in our action on this bill, finally, conclusively, and irrevocably put an end to attempts—from whatever source—to cut and undercut the vocational-education program.

It was proposed last year that the Federal contribution to vocational education under the George-Barden Act be reduced by 25 percent. This proposition met with some harassment in committee, but it was here on the floor of the House that the real battle was joined and won.

I would have thought that the sentiment of the Members was clearly expressed a year ago. But, apparently not, for I was dismayed to see the budget contain a recommendation for a 6.4 percent reduction in next year's appropriation. In the light of certain remarks from responsible quarters, it became apparent that this more modest reduction, if allowed to stand, represented a planned policy of emasculation of the Federal program.

Outspoken opposition from the friends of vocational education was not long in coming. Many of us joined in expressing our strong protest against any tampering with the established program.

It is gratifying that the administration's subsequent reversal of its position and the committee bill we debate today apparently indicate acquiescence in the determination of vocational education supporters to prevent any reduction in the program.

I hope we shall make it clear by our action on this bill that no future reduction in Federal assistance for vocational training will be tolerated. The real need of vocational education today is for ex-

pansion. We are faced with a steadily increasing population, a growing shortage of school buildings, facilities, and teachers. At the same time we are presented with the sober findings by the Director of Defense Mobilization that "our supply of highly trained and skilled workers is not keeping abreast of the current and potential requirements," and that "maintenance of the necessary farm-labor force would be one of the serious manpower problems in full mobilization."

A strong vocational program is an integral part of a strong school system and at the same time offers the only opportunity for training the skilled manpower necessary to our continued growth and security. Viewed from the standpoint of the millions of boys and girls—and young men and women—who benefit from the training each year, vocational education helps them to integrate themselves in rewarding, productive tasks commensurate with their abilities and interests. For most it is the closest they ever get to college. It is part of the promise of America—to help them to help themselves. The individuals benefit, and the Nation benefits. The money this Government spends on vocational education is well invested.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], for the excellent presentation he has made of H. R. 9447. His talk has greatly impressed me with the need for increased appropriations for vocational education and educational rehabilitation. I will be on the floor all during the debate on H. R. 9447 and will give whatever aid I can to the amendment by speaking for it and voting for it when the amendment to increase the appropriations comes up tomorrow.

As one who has felt keenly the loss of loved ones from cancer, I can agree with all the remarks made by Congressman FOGARTY on the work of the new Public Health Center at Bethesda, Md. When I finally decided to run for Congress, I pledged that at every opportunity I had, if elected, I would do all within my power to fight this dread disease of cancer, whose yearly toll is 200,000 lives. There is scarcely a person alive today who has not lost some loved relative or friend from cancer. We all know that money is essential for research if this disease is to be conquered and I shall support the amendments to provide more money for such needed research.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] for the splendid work he has done in presenting our side of this measure. Other members of the Oklahoma delegation and I certainly agree with the amendments that will be offered tomorrow, which we trust will be adopted on the following day. As chairman of our Oklahoma delegation I desire to compliment our State director of vocational education in Oklahoma, Mr. J. B. Perky,

for the splendid work he has done, and also Mr. M. J. De Benning, supervisor, vocational distributive education in Oklahoma, and his associates for the splendid work that they have done.

DISTRIBUTIVE OCCUPATIONS EDUCATION IN OKLAHOMA

Mr. Chairman, the economic stability of a State depends in large measure upon the efficiency of management and workers in the distributive occupations, efficiency which must be gained through study and experience. Distributive education provides such training. Persons who wish to build a career in merchandising will find in this educational program an opportunity to acquire information and skills essential to success in distribution.

Subjects. Vocational distributive occupations education is a program of training for workers directly engaged in merchandising activities, or in contact with buyers and sellers when, first, distributing to consumers, retailers, jobbers, wholesalers, and others the products of farm and industry; or selling services; or, second, managing, operating, or conducting a retail, wholesale, or service business.

Accordingly, distributive occupations subjects under the provisions of the George-Barden Act, are vocational subjects taught in part-time and evening schools and classes to persons 16 years of age or older who are employed in distributive occupations. Therefore, such subjects are designed, first, to increase the skill, knowledge, and ability of workers already employed in a specific distributive occupation; or, second, to prepare workers in a distributive occupation for changing to a related kind of work in another distributive occupation or for promotion to positions of a higher occupational level.

Vocational distributive occupations subjects contribute to increased skill, technical knowledge, occupational information, understanding, morale, appreciation, or judgment of workers in distributive occupations.

THE NEEDS FOR DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION

Potential trainees: More than 30,000 retail and wholesale establishments operate in Oklahoma and employ a force in excess of 112,000 people. Their sales in a recent year rose to the astounding total of \$3,354,016,000.

The 112,000 people who are working in distributive occupations in normal times, will find an average of 1 of every 5 persons from their number leaving his job each year. Thus, 20 percent of the workers vacate more than 20,000 jobs into which other people will move, many for their first job. It is a distressing fact that very few of this vast group of workers will have had previous training in the jobs they accept.

Moreover, research has shown that, for the Nation as a whole, more than 130,000 youths 18 and 19 years of age and 150,000 between the ages of 20 and 24 years enter their first employment in some type of distributive field each year, a total of 280,000 American youths. Assuming this number to be divided among the States, Oklahoma thus has approxi-

mately 5,000 young people who will enter distribution annually.

Expansion needed: The vocational distributive education program, the nationally approved training program specifically designed to prepare young people for the field of merchandising, has not had sufficient funds to meet the unprecedented demand for training. Of the 100,000 boys and girls who annually enroll in the 809 Oklahoma high schools, only a very small number will have an opportunity to enroll in a distributive education class. The program, being in only 23 of the 809 high schools, has trained annually fewer than 800 students in the basic knowledges and skills of merchandising. Many other schools, deeply concerned over the future economic well-being of their graduates, are waiting in vain for programs.

The program in the State should be expanded. More young people who would choose the merchandising field as their life's work deserve an opportunity to secure the proper and essential training. The present program is pitifully inadequate because funds, and hence staff, are not available to meet the reported demands from an estimated 4,000 students who would enroll each year. Distributive education must be offered in a greater number of Oklahoma high schools. More youths wish seriously to avail themselves of the training they need to prepare them to do better the job in which they are going to find themselves anyway, and when employed to become more efficient workers. Once trained, they will in turn improve our entire system of distribution and through it make a valuable contribution to the economic stability of our State.

Followup studies have revealed that approximately 50 percent of the pupils who finish 1 or 2 years of training in the distributive education program remain in distributive occupations. This is a gratifying record when we consider the many and variable nature of the factors that enter into the selection and placement of teen-age students who choose to seek a career in merchandising.

Since distributive education has become a part of the State's educational program, steady and encouraging progress has been made in reception accorded the program by students, parents, school administrators, and merchants alike. It has been meeting a felt need of each group. Hundreds of young men and women have been able to complete 4 years of high school who otherwise would not have found it possible. High-school students, often at a loss in choosing an occupation, have discovered in the program a valuable aid in finding themselves. To some it has opened the path to a 4-year college education.

The steady progress of the distributive education program in Oklahoma is ample evidence of the high value placed on it by school administrators, merchants, parents, and students. Since 1938, it has grown from 8 cooperative part-time classes in high schools with an enrollment of 208 to 23 classes with an enrollment of 743. In its brief 15 years as an educational force, more than 8,000

high-school boys and girls have profited from the training and experience they received in distributive education courses and gone forth with a good start into the economic life of our State.

Requests for programs are received from several additional schools each year. These demands can only be met when additional funds are available.

CASE HISTORIES AND RESEARCH EXCERPTS

The following excerpts were taken from a report made by Maj. Charles H. Ruley in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of master of science, 1954. These data are on file in the State office at Stillwater, Okla. Anyone desiring proof of the validity or authenticity of this information is urged to examine the study from which these excerpts were taken.

Excerpt No. 1:

I feel the distributive education program is a very wonderful thing for the young people in high school. It gives them a chance to get their feet on solid ground and a headstart toward a secure future. The training and experience it gave me is invaluable. The work is closely supervised and I feel this work will continue to prove more and more important in school systems.

Excerpt No. 2:

The only thing I think could be said is that more boys and girls should take distributive education and more businessmen take part in this wonderful organization. I know it helped me very much and if I ever get the opportunity to hire a distributive education student, I would be proud to, because I know they are well qualified to hold and do a good job.

Excerpt No. 3:

We have a good program going on in (name of town omitted). I think it (distributive education) should be taken by every student. Also, I think there should be adult courses related to different jobs.

Excerpt No. 4:

The only comment is that I am sorry more people are not exposed to distributive education, because my employer and I both agree that it is one of the most profitable subjects ever introduced in high school and one from which a person and his employer will benefit most.

Excerpt No. 5:

I think it (distributive education) is one of the finest organizations ever sponsored by a school. I think it provides the best sales training that a person could get.

Excerpt No. 6:

They have a wonderful DE program here now and I can't think of any improvement, but it is almost a must if a boy or girl is planning to go into the selling or merchandising field after finishing school.

Excerpt No. 7:

I do believe the DE training offered in high school has been most beneficial to me, particularly since I have just completed 5 years with the same firm in which Mr. ———, my DE instructor, helped to place me.

Excerpt No. 8:

The teacher that I had was very outstanding. She has done more for the children of medium- and low-income families than anyone else in the school. I have seen her time and again take a student with an inferiority complex, find him a job, help him to overcome his complex, and teach him to be a useful employee. We have a DE student in our business every year. This program is a

very important part of the school system. I am very thankful that I was able to take DE in high school.

Excerpt No. 9:

I have no criticism about the DE program. It is being carried out very fine at _____ high school. Mr. _____ is one of the most outstanding teachers I have ever had in any school of training. Our store is backing DE all the way this year. Distributive education is one of the best courses to take to help you all the way through life.

Excerpt No. 10:

It wouldn't hurt if everyone in high school would take at least 1 full year of distributive education. It really helps you in more ways than one when you get out on your own. Every day I meet problems that I wouldn't know how to solve if it hadn't been for DE that I had in high school.

The following case histories are submitted in evidence of the service the program of distributive education has rendered to the youth of Oklahoma who have been fortunate enough to have the opportunity to enroll in it.

Case history No. 1:

Mrs. Juanita Pevetoe was one of the first graduates of the DE program in Oklahoma. She gained her work experience in a department store. Shortly after graduation she went to the S. H. Kress Co. She is still there, as a supervisor.

Case history No. 2:

Oliver Reed was graduated from high school in May 1943. He was a member of the distributive education class during his senior year, being employed in a shoestore as a salesperson.

In December of 1943, Oliver enlisted in the merchant marines, where he served for 3 years. At the conclusion of his military service, he returned to his hometown and began working for a different shoestore. After 7 years with this firm, Oliver is convinced that salesmanship is his forte, and he is definitely planning on a partnership or a business of his own.

He is one of several outstanding businessmen who received his initial training in distributive education classes.

Case history No. 3:

Bob Henrichs graduated in 1950. After serving in the United States Army, he retired in Dallas, Tex., where he now owns and operates his own paint and wallpaper store. He worked in this type of store while he was in high school.

Case history No. 4:

Barbara Mead graduated in 1952. She started her sales experience with selling shoes in the children's shoe department of a large department store. For 1 year she continued her part-time work and attended the University of Tulsa. She is now one of the regular salespeople in the newly remodeled I. Miller Shoe Co.

Case history No. 5:

Arthur Carol Meek is now the junior partner of the Meed Furniture Co. This is the family company he was with when he enrolled in DE for a 2-year course. He graduated in 1948.

Case history No. 6:

Colleen McVay Thies sold clothing in a department store sports shop in 1947 while in DE. She is now married and has two children for which she is now more than partly financially responsible. She is working as a model and saleslady in one of Oklahoma's finest women's shops.

Case history No. 7:

Joe Ray finished high school in January, 1951. In order to qualify as a member of the distributive education class in high school, Joe was employed part-time during his junior and senior years by a shoe company and department store.

After graduation, he worked for 6 months in the shoe department of one of the larger department stores. Later, he was employed by a local independent shoe store as assistant manager, where he remained for several months.

Because Joe was young and eager, he decided to go into business for himself; so he purchased a service station which he operated successfully for several months. Only Joe's desire to return to a retail store caused him to sell his service station and reenter the shoe department at the store where he was formerly employed.

Last week Joe was rewarded for his ardent work and untiring effort. The personnel officers of this organization promoted and transferred this fine young man to the Muskogee store, where he will serve as division manager of the shoe department.

Joe plans to stay with this big business concern, where he hopes to make a career of retailing and merchandising. He is now 22 years old, married, and well on the way to realizing his aim and ambition.

Mr. Chairman, it is my studied opinion that certain language in the 1954 appropriation for the Health, Education, and Welfare Act as it relates to vocational rehabilitation will seriously curtail the effectiveness of this highly vital and important program in most of the States.

The language, "Provided further, That the amount apportioned to a State for fiscal year 1955, shall not exceed \$1 for each 75 cents contributed by the State for the same purpose," will reduce Federal aid to the States for fiscal year 1955 to the extent of \$3,800,000, and in Oklahoma to the extent of \$69 million.

The States are not in a position to vote the necessary funds for continuation of the program because State legislatures in most States will not be in regular session until January 1955. In many States this reduction in funds will mean a drastic curtailment of services and the laying off of highly qualified and experienced personnel.

President Eisenhower recognized these facts in his special message to Congress, in which he recommended a considerable expansion of vocational rehabilitation services during the next 5-year period. In order to carry out the President's recommendations for expansion of the program, or for that matter to maintain the present level of service, it is absolutely necessary that the language quoted above be repealed.

It is obviously the intent of this language to require the States to carry a greater part of the financial load of this program, which is also the President's views on the program. I will call the committee's attention to the fact that the Federal Government participates to the extent of 60 percent of public assistance, and that it hardly seems reasonable that the Federal Government should be more interested in public assistance for disabled people than it is in their rehabilitation.

On the other hand, if the States are to be expected to increase their participation as sharply as required by the language above, they must be given time in which to make the necessary adjustments.

It has been my observation, through the years, that the vocational rehabilitation service is one of the most constructive of the several grants-in-aid programs. Not only does the program return thousands of disabled adult persons to useful employment each year, it actually results in a tremendous saving of public funds that otherwise would be required for public assistance.

It is estimated that for each dollar spent toward this program, the Government actually gets back \$10 because of the increased earning power of rehabilitated persons.

During the 3-year period from June 30, 1950, to June 30, 1953, in Oklahoma alone, the program has provided services to 9,593 handicapped people, and of this number 3,766 have been gainfully employed. This group's annual earning showed a gain of \$6,053,880 after rehabilitation.

Even overshadowing the monetary phase of the program is the fact that in this country where we assume equality of opportunity in the pursuit of human happiness, it is our obligation to see that physical disability brought about by disease or injury does not result in the destruction of those qualities which make a man a self-respecting citizen. Any other attitude is to deny the principles of liberty and equality, on which this country was founded.

It is my earnest belief that the members of the committee do not wish to virtually halt a program as constructive as this one and I request the committee to take the necessary steps to appropriate \$24 million for 1955, which is the minimum amount required to maintain the service at its present level.

Mr. Chairman, it must come with something of a shock to the American people—to say nothing of our educators—that in an estimated Federal budget of \$65,600,000,000 for 1955, the piddling sum of \$24,785,122 is set aside for so vital a need as vocational education in an American population of 152 million. The impact of the shock is accentuated by the fact that this niggardly figure represents an effort to cut Federal expenditures for vocational education in the United States 4.7 percent from the previous budget.

If this shortsighted economy in the wrong place means that this administration is planning to pull the Federal rug altogether from under vocational education in the United States, then I charge that this is an act approaching dangerously close to an entirely new form of national scandal. In principle it is violently reversing a policy established by Congress as far back as 1862 when Federal assistance for the development of agricultural and mechanical arts in colleges was first approved. In 1917, Federal aid was approved for secondary schools by enactment of the

Smith-Hughes Act. Periodically additional funds were appropriated by subsequent acts until we come to the George-Barden Act of 1946 on behalf of which I especially wish to record my support.

I have studied several hundred of the 1,181 pages of the President's budget for 1955, and I can find items on almost every page—some worthy, some less worthy—but none of them so important to the basic welfare of the United States, none of them with so enduring a value to our people and to our national strength and standard of living, as the item for vocational education. This, if anything, should certainly be increased, not decreased. I would not have believed it possible that figures in a budget could say so plainly, bluntly, and cruelly to the youth of America: "Go hand!"

This unthinking penuriousness to education in America, on a fundamentally functional phase, is potentially so full of disaster for the careers of untold thousands of our people that I cannot refrain from employing the strong language which describes it as a stab in the back to one of our country's greatest needs. Of course, I am sensitive to the problem, and perhaps more acutely aware of its overall implications, because as a member of the Armed Services Committee I know to our shame what lack of vocational education meant to our military forces and to the war effort during the critical months of World War II. In desperation our military energies and resources had to be diverted to educating our men on the seas and in the field vocationally, in order to make them, through intense methods of training and with untold haste and waste, competent to handle the skilled and technical work that is a part of modern warfare—and a part of modern industry in peace.

Had we spent a fraction of the money and infinitely less time doing some of that job of vocational training by Federal aid in peacetime, the United States might have saved itself untold sums and shortened the war.

A study of the ramifications of the problem will show that Federal aid, as the Congress saw as far back as 1862, is an indispensable part of the program—Federal aid supplementing the educational program in the States. Some States by the nature of their economy and the limits of their wealth need Federal aid to vocational training in different degrees and proportions.

In Oklahoma, for example, about half of that State's youth is being served by vocational education—half. To reduce it would have a calamitous effect on many individual youngsters and leave a progressively more expansive gap in the progress and competence of Oklahoma's youth over the years, rendering them by that much, less able to meet the demands of the future. Who can calculate the detrimental influence this would have on families yet unborn? Who can say how much this knifing of the education of America's youth would render them less useful in emergencies of national or international import that

might strike our security in the coming years?

Economy? Of course we believe in economy. But not the purblind economy that dwarfs the education of the future citizens of America, citizens of a democracy in which education is as indispensable as the air we breathe, to say nothing of the old axiom that knowledge is power. And power is what we shall doubly be called upon to provide against the ugly enemy that faces us from the Kremlin. That is why I plead with all the earnestness I can command that vocational education be amplified through additional Federal aid and not shrunk. In Oklahoma, my studies show, there is a need for an increase of 100 percent in vocational units in agriculture; 75 percent in distributive education; 100 percent in home economics; and 75 percent in trades and industries.

There are advantages to the Nation as a whole that do not show up in a budget and that are derived, I am sure, directly from the money we spend on vocational training.

We live today in a tragic consequence of our neglect of education in the past. What a false and visionless frugality that was. The consequences that have grown out of that neglect can be counted in the limited capacity of many of our citizens to earn a living, in their vulnerability to the influences of depression, their incapacity to work themselves out of their difficulties. Search through the army of the unemployed and see how many are nearly unemployable, or altogether unemployable, because of a lack of skills that vocational education would have prevented. The dollar we save in a Federal budget on vocational education today comes back to haunt us with thousands of dollars lost, with family tragedy, with relief and other evil consequences a decade later. It has its effect, too, on juvenile delinquency and touches the whole Nation in almost every part of its economic, political, social, and community life.

It is good to economize, but not on America's youth—not on America's future—and not on America's security.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read a wire which I just received:

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 7, 1954.
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Strongly urge your vote and utmost efforts to pass Abbutt amendment adding \$6 million to funds for vocational education. Even this is almost 20 percent short of George-Barden Act authorization and more than 50 percent short of needs of high-school students for vocational education services.

JAMES G. PATTON,
President, National Farmers Union.

Mr. Chairman, I feel the amounts voted for administration expenses and building costs under Public Laws 815 and 874 are worthwhile, but insufficient.

Mr. Chairman, the members of the Oklahoma delegation who intended to attend the West Point graduation today stayed over in order to vote on this bill.

(Mr. WICKERSHAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time and ask that the Clerk do now read.

The Clerk read through line 2, page 2.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NICHOLSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9447) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 429)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, the bill, H. R. 1026, "to amend the Public Health Service Act, with respect to the provisions of certain medical and dental treatment and hospitalization for certain officers and employees of the former Lighthouse Service, and for dependents and widows of officers and employees of such Service."

From 1910 to July 1939, the Lighthouse Service was manned by civilian personnel. On July 1, 1939, under a reorganization plan, the Lighthouse Service was absorbed by the Coast Guard. The Coast Guard put into uniform those employees of the former Lighthouse Service who were willing and qualified to accept military appointments. Those employees who wanted to remain civilians were allowed to do so.

This enactment would extend entitlement to medical care and hospitalization at Public Health facilities under certain circumstances to a number of categories of former Lighthouse Service employees, their dependents, and widows. The bill, however, by according such benefits to one group of Federal employees alone, would discriminate against the vast body of Federal workers. In fact, under the enactment, situations would arise in which former Lighthouse Service employees working side by side with other Federal employees and doing exactly the same type of work would enjoy benefits to which their fellow civil servants would not be entitled. H. R. 1026 would also discriminate against uniformed personnel of the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service. It would establish a statutory entitlement to benefits for the widows of former Lighthouse Service personnel which are not provided generally to the widows of the uniformed personnel enumerated above.

Moreover, the enactment would constitute an unfortunate precedent. Other

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued June 10, 1954
For actions of June 9, 1954
83rd-2nd, No. 106

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....	14	Fruits & vegetables.....	11	Research.....	23
Appropriations.....	4,7,14	Labor, farm.....	4,25	Social security.....	25
Atomic energy.....	16	Lands, transfer.....	13	Soil conservation.....	12,21
Containers.....	11	Legislative program.....	5,14	Surplus commodities.....	2,22
Education.....	4,19	Loans, farm.....	15	Taxation.....	12
Electrification.....	17	Marketing.....	6	Tobacco.....	6
Expenditures.....	8	Personnel.....	8	Trade, foreign.....	5,9,20
Extension service.....	8,23	Price supports.....	10,24	TVA.....	18
Farm program.....	24	Property.....	8	Vehicles.....	8
Food, distribution.....	2,22	Reclamation.....	3,16	Wool.....	20
Forestry.....	1				

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed O&C land jurisdiction bill. House committees reported bills to dispose of surplus commodities and to authorize Colo. reclamation project. House debated Labor-HEW appropriation bill. Senate concurred in House amendments to bill to increase excess-tobacco penalty. Senate committees reported State, Justice, Commerce appropriation bill. Sen. Beall defended Secretary's price-support program. Sen. Gillette criticized leadership for not acting sooner on trade-agreements bill, and Sen. Ferguson took issue with him. Sen. Thye inserted his recent speech discussing use of surplus commodities.

HOUSE

1. FORESTRY. Passed without amendment S. 2225, relating to administrative jurisdiction over certain O&C land in Oreg. (pp. 7539-41). This bill will now be sent to the President. The bill provides for continued administration of the controverted lands by the Forest Service, with accounting of funds heretofore or hereafter received to be the same as for other O&C land receipts, and provides for consolidation of the checker-board administrative areas through exchanges of land by the Agriculture and Interior Departments.
2. SURPLUS COMMODITIES. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment S. 2475, to authorize the President to use agricultural commodities to improve the foreign relations of the U. S. (H. Rept. 1776)(p. 7552).
3. RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment H. R. 4449, to authorize Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects (H. Rept. 1774)(p. 7552).
4. LABOR-HEW APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955. Continued debate on this bill, H. R. 9447 (pp. 7505-39). Agreed to an amendment by Rep. Abbitt to increase by \$5,298,750 the amount for vocational education, particularly in agriculture (pp. 7516-32). Rejected, 77-81, an amendment by Rep. Van Zandt to provide \$100,000, under Bureau of Labor Standards, for assisting organizations that work to improve the condition of migratory farm workers (pp. 7505-10).
5. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. Walleck said debate would continue on the Labor-HEW

appropriation bill
/today and that the trade-agreements bill will be considered Friday (p. 7541).

SENATE

6. TOBACCO QUOTAS. Concurred in the House amendments to S. 3050, to increase the penalty on marketing tobacco in excess of quotas from 40% to 50% of the average market price, effective July 1, 1955 (pp. 7498-9). This bill will now be sent to the President.
7. STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955. The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments this bill, H. R. 8067 (S. Rept. 1541)(p. 7458).
8. MOTOR VEHICLES; PROPERTY; EXTENSION WORK. The Government Operations Committee reported without amendment S. 3199, to authorize additional use of Government motor vehicles at isolated Government installations (S. Rept. 1536); S. 3243, to extend until June 30, 1955, the period during which disposals of surplus property may be made by negotiation (S. Rept. 1537); and H. J. Res. 300, to sell certain surplus land in Kerr County, Tex., to the Texas Hill County Development Foundation for use of 4-H clubs, etc. (S. Rept. 1538)(p. 7458).
8. PERSONNEL; EXPENDITURES. Sen. Byrd inserted an additional report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures regarding employment (pp. 7458-61).
9. TRADE AGREEMENTS. Sen. Gillette spoke in favor of continuation of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and criticized the Republican leadership for not acting sooner on this matter. Sen. Ferguson took issue with him on this and stated that no hardship would result if the Act is not extended prior to its expiration. (pp. 7464-7.)
10. PRICE SUPPORTS. Sen. Beall defended Secretary Benson's flexible price-support program and outlined the various farm and other organizations which participated in its development (p. 7487).
11. CONTAINERS. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) H. R. 8357, to amend the Standard Container Act to provide for a 3/8 bushel basket (p. 7454).
12. TAXATION. The Finance Committee completed marking up H. R. 8300, the general tax revision bill, following which it was announced that the Committee had taken further tentative actions with respect to provisions of the House-passed version, including Sec. 175 on soil-water conservation expenditures, as follows: "The committee reconsidered this provision and decided to make it applicable in the case of certain special assessment expenditures of the taxpayer for water conservation" (pp. 7452-4).
13. LAND TRANSFER. H.R. 3097, to donate the USDA Grape Station at Oakville Calif., to the Univ. of Calif., was made the Senate's unfinished business (p. 7500).
14. ADJOURNED until Fri., June 11 (p. 7502). The Legislative Program as announced by Majority Leader Knowland: Fri., it is expected that the unfinished business will be laid aside and the State, Justice, Commerce appropriation bill will be considered (p. 7502).

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG

(Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully recommend to the attention of this body action taken by the Senate in the waning hours of yesterday's proceedings in passing House Joint Resolution 243, to amend the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, so as to include the words "under God."

Together with my colleagues in both Houses of the Congress, and with the citizens of this Nation, young and old alike, I rejoice in the passage of this resolution.

I have addressed today a letter to the President, setting out the wish of the Members that the bill be signed on or before Flag Day, June 14. This letter is inserted in the RECORD at this point:

The PRESIDENT,

*The White House,
Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Yesterday, House Joint Resolution 243, to amend the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States of America to include the words "under God," received final approval by the Congress, thus clearing it for Presidential signature. Mr. President, 17 Members of the House and 1 Member of the Senate introduced bills on this subject. The original bill was introduced by me on April 20, 1953. Attached is a list of the Members of Congress who introduced bills on this subject.

Would it be convenient, with your heavy schedule, to extend an invitation to the group who sponsored this legislation to be present at the time you sign this resolution?

I am most proud of the action of the Congress in approving this measure. It is so fitting that we declare to the world, in our position as leader among the sister nations of the earth, our dependence upon almighty God. As the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD related in many places during the discussion of this measure, Flag Day is June 14. It is the wish of the Members that the signing take place on or before that day, that the new pledge of allegiance may be recited officially, beginning this year on Flag Day.

With kind personal regards and best wishes, I am

Very respectfully yours,

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
Member of Congress.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 79]

Ashmore	Carrigg	Donovan
Barrett	Celler	Dorn, S. C.
Beamer	Chelf	Doyle
Becker	Chenoweth	Feighan
Biatnik	Curtis, Mass.	Frazier
Buckley	Davis, Tenn.	Green
Burdick	Dingell	Gubser
Camp	Dodd	Hagen, Calif.
Carlyle	Dolliver	Hagen, Minn.

Hardy	Mailliard	Shuford
Heller	Miller, Calif.	Simpson, Pa.
Hinshaw	Morgan	Sutton
Holt	Moulder, Mo.	Taylor
Holtzman	Nelson	Utt
Hruska	O'Brien, N. Y.	Van Pelt
Jackson	Philbin	Weichel
James	Pillion	Wier
Jarman	Powell	Willis
Jenkins	Radwan	Wilson, Calif.
Johnson, Calif.	Richards	Wilson, Tex.
Kersten, Wis.	Riley	Wolcott
King, Calif.	Roosevelt	Yorty
King, Pa.	Saylor	Zablocki
Krueger	Sheehan	
Machrowicz	Sheppard	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 349 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS ON THE LATE HONORABLE HAROLD G. HOFFMAN

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their own remarks in the RECORD, immediately following my remarks with reference to the late Honorable Harold G. Hoffman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 9447) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois:

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 9447, with Mr. NICHOLSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read down to and including page 2, line 2. Are there any amendments at this point? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the promotion of industrial safety, employment stabilization, and amicable industrial relations for labor and industry; performance of safety functions of the Secretary under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (5 U. S. C. 784 (c)); performance of the functions vested in the Secretary by title I of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 159 (f) and (g)); and not to exceed \$70,000 for the work of the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, as authorized by the act of

July 11, 1949 (63 Stat. 409), including purchase of reports and of material for informational exhibits and expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at conferences concerned with the work of the Bureau of Labor Standards, \$655,000.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VAN ZANDT:

On page 3, line 1, after the semicolon, insert the following: "not to exceed \$100,000 for improving the Division of Migratory Labor."

On page 3, line 8, strike out "\$655,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$755,000."

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, before proposing an amendment to the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations bill, I want to commend the committee for the insight and devotion with which they blended the need for economy in government and the necessity of continuing the Government's humanitarian program, which is so close to President's Eisenhower's heart.

This bill is the place where the American people will look for the human liberalism which our great President has so often called a basic principle of the Eisenhower administration.

By and large, I think the committee has done a great job, and one for which the Congress and the country can be grateful.

There is one program, however, which I do not see in the bill as reported. The President considered this item so important that he called special attention to it in his budget message. Let me read you what he said:

The social and economic plight of migratory farmworkers has been studied repeatedly. Up to now little positive action to better these conditions has been taken by the Federal Government. This budget includes a recommended appropriation of \$100,000 to enable the Department of Labor to provide leadership in establishing a cooperative Federal-State program in the fiscal year 1955.

I should therefore like to move, Mr. Chairman, for the insertion of \$100,000 in the Labor Department's Bureau of Labor Standards budget for assisting the States and the many church and civic organizations interested in improving the working conditions of American migrant agricultural workers.

In offering this amendment, I am fully cognizant of the statement made by the committee that—

There are many agencies of the Federal Government doing work in this field.

However, I want to direct your attention specifically to the President's message in which he states:

This budget includes a recommended appropriation of \$100,000 to the Department of Labor to provide leadership.

I feel that this leadership is necessary in order to establish a cooperative Fed-

eral-State program in this field of activity.

It is possible that the committee, with its many burdens and responsibilities, did not have an opportunity to get all the facts on this matter.

Therefore I wish to emphasize that some 1 million American citizens and their families move about the country cultivating and harvesting our crops.

This army of migratory workers assists in placing on the American dinner tables the fine variety of foods that sustain our health and which represent the rich harvests of America's broad acres.

For too long a time we have taken these willing servants for granted.

Their livelihood is completely at the mercy of the elements—of the rains which may wash out crops in one State and prevent their labors, of droughts in another State, which dry up the crops—and render them idle and unemployed.

The employment of these migratory farmworkers is irregular and therefore their earnings are low.

As they wander over this vast land, they have no home they can call their own.

Citizens of America, but of no particular State, they do not share in the social-security benefits available to the millions and for which this House has just voted.

They enjoy virtually none of the benefits which this Congress and our marvelous economy have provided for other workers and which we all take for granted.

Because they wander from place to place, their children do not get the advantages which your children and mine receive as a matter of law and right.

Because they are not residents of the State and county where they currently work, these migratory farmworkers and their families have no access to community services available to local residents.

Surely the wealthiest Nation on earth has no right to depend upon the labor of these migratory workers and at the same time to ignore their plight.

The present administration has repeatedly called for the removal of the distinctions between the vast majority of our people and these second-class citizens.

Their pitiful condition can no longer be ignored.

It will inure to the everlasting benefit of this Nation to accord these migratory farm workers the full rights and privileges of citizenship.

The injustices we permit them to suffer are not unknown to our enemies in Communist lands.

They are held up as examples of our materialistic greed and economic exploitation.

Mr. Chairman, in correcting the injustice to migratory farm workers, we will strike another blow for freedom and against the Communist Party line.

The bill before us provides over a million and a half dollars for the Mexican national program to bring in Mexican citizens to work alongside our own citizens in the fields.

In the face of that fact, how can we plead economy in denying \$100,000 to improve the quality and stability of this American work force?

The \$100,000 will assist in improving the efficiency and production of the farmer who employs these American migrants in addition to improving the working and living standards of these migratory workers.

This modest sum will also permit the mobilization of State and community interest and cooperation.

Some States have done a great deal to find ways of solving their problems. Others have done little or nothing.

Some States have set up interdepartmental committees, bringing together the interest of labor, agriculture, and other State departments, which have made real progress in meeting the most serious of the migrants' needs.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I congratulate the gentleman on the statement he is making. I shall support his amendment, which restores to the bill the amount requested by the President in his budget message to the Congress.

The problems facing the million migrant agricultural workers who are citizens of the United States are real. These workers are essential to our national economy. For many years the plight of these workers has been studied, Government reports have been written, recommendations have been made, and yet no action to improve the situation has been taken.

Many of these migrant workers have no home, and, in fact, no rights as citizens, their children receive little or no education, many of them are truly the unprotected people of America.

The committee was right in pointing out that many agencies of Government are doing work in this field. However, the old adage, "What is everybody's business is nobody's business" certainly is true when it comes to migrants.

The President has proposed that the Labor Department assume that responsibility by getting the various agencies of Government to work as a team in giving attention to the problems of these workers. Migration is an interstate as well as an intrastate problem. Federal and State Governments must work together with citizens groups, growers, and representatives of labor on the problem if we are to get results. Some agency must accept the role of leadership. That agency in my opinion, and in the opinion of the President of the United States, is the Labor Department. I support the Van Zandt amendment which will give to the Labor Department the money requested by the President so that the Department may get started on this essential program.

(Mr. SEELY-BROWN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I thank the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. The commissioner of labor of our State, Edward Corsi, known throughout the country, feels that this is one of the major problems of the labor departments of the States, and that what the gentleman recommends is absolutely needed by the States. I will support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this proposal of the administration is sound. We have had this problem of agricultural migrants in our country since the beginning of the century. These people migrate because the farmer needs them to harvest seasonal crops and because they need work to support their families. They are without doubt among the most underprivileged of any group of workers in this great country. We pride ourselves, and rightly so, on the progress we have made in insuring the workers of America a high standard of living and the basic security to which we feel the American worker is entitled. But little or none of these privileges are accorded the migrant.

In my State of New York, we have worked for years on this program and we have made progress. There is still much to be done and we know that since many problems are interstate in character that we can go only so far unless similar action is taken in other States. This is essentially a labor problem and Edward Corsi, the outstanding labor commissioner of my State of New York, has stated many times that this is a No. 1 problem of labor departments and that it is one on which the Federal and State government agencies must work together if we are to achieve results.

Nongovernment groups, church, labor, and other voluntary agencies have given wide support to this proposal of the administration to get into action on this front on the national level after a quarter of a century. To vote for this money will not only be a vote toward a better life for the migrants and their families; it will be one way of insuring better and more stable workers for the farmers. We know this from our own experience in New York. I support the amendment of my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

(Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BONIN. I wish to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania for having submitted this amendment to this bill because I feel that it is a constructive move and one that will meet with the approval of the citizens generally.

Mr. Chairman, I consider the present bill exceptionally worth while except for several sections. The first sizeable cut is in the Bureau of Labor Standards. The President of the United States recommended some months ago that \$100,000 be appropriated to help American migratory workers. Unless Congress does something about this problem today

we shall be aiding and abetting American migratory workers and their families to live under conditions that are substandard to that of Mexican migratory employees.

I am of the opinion that it is our responsibility to institute this action and the easiest way to do it is by supporting the Van Zandt amendment. The amendment if approved will give us a start in the right direction. It should be noted that in some States American migratory workers are not used and in others they are not wanted. By supporting this amendment we will accomplish much to alleviate the hardships of more than a million people engaged in migratory employment.

(Mr. BONIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I support the gentleman's amendment and the statement he has made. I would like to point out that while other agencies may have money to do this, it is a case of what is everybody's business is nobody's business; and this \$100,000 will make possible the employment of a group of people to concentrate on this subject.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I thank the gentleman.

In so doing the farmers have recognized the improvement in the quality and productivity of the migrants who seek to return each year.

In many communities church and other citizen groups have set up successful programs that have helped not only the migrant but the farmer.

But the States and organizations are constantly seeking help from the United States Department of Labor in this inherently interstate labor problem.

They should be equipped to tell States and organizations the successful experience of others.

They should be able to report what has worked and just as important what has not worked.

How can the State agencies help the local growers' association, the church groups, the welfare agencies, the PTA, to use this necessary migrant labor supply so it will prove an asset to the buying power and social life of the community?

How can these necessary migrant workers be used so they will not spread disease, immorality, and crime throughout the area?

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the \$100,000 requested to be restored by my amendment is sorely needed in improving the status of the some million Americans who comprise the migratory farm workers of the Nation.

We appropriate billions of dollars for foreign aid on the ground that we must rehabilitate the economy of other nations.

Therefore, I am certain that by approving my amendment requesting \$100,000 for a domestic migrant program we are making a worthwhile in-

vestment in the morale and well-being of American citizens, and for that reason alone the amendment should receive favorable consideration.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I must say that, as chairman of the subcommittee, I am disappointed that an amendment should be proposed to this bill so early in its reading today. The committee worked hard to bring out a bill that would be as close to what everyone wanted as possible. We thought there might be a possibility of its being accepted with only 1 or 2 small amendments by the committee, but I suppose some Members have been asked by various groups to offer amendments restoring certain reductions in the bill. Unfortunately, the proposed amendment would not accomplish what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] thinks it would, judging from the statement he has made.

Under this amendment, a new group of Federal employees would be set up. After it was set up, if you added this money to the bill, the work would have to be done in the States, in the final analysis anyway, because all that the Federal employees would do would be to consult, advise, and recommend. Over the years we have had testimony concerning many instances of good work the States and the communities have done in this respect without any help from Federal bureaucrats. The States know more about the situation than any bureaucrat sitting here in Washington could.

I am not opposed to what the gentleman would like to see happen; but, as I stated in general debate yesterday, this proposed migrant-labor program is not one which will benefit the industrial worker, as some Members seem to think; this pertains to migrant labor in agriculture.

This problem is now being dealt with in many agencies of the Federal Government: The Children's Bureau, the Bureau of Labor Standards, the Office of Education, Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Employment Security, the Wage and Hour Division, Public Health Service, and I am not sure how many more. Just last week, Mrs. Hobby opened an east coast conference on this same subject.

Let me read to you from page 422 of the hearings when we had the Children's Bureau under discussion, merely to give you an idea of what just one of these agencies is already doing:

Mr. BUSBEY. Doctor, what is the Bureau doing currently in connection with children of migrant agricultural workers?

Dr. ELIOT. The Bureau is very active, together with other constituent members of the Department, in this field. One member of our staff has been taking the leading part in bringing together the studies of the health, research, and child-welfare groups. The program currently in progress is an effort to bring together the health, education, and welfare and private voluntary organization interest in 10 States along the eastern seaboard to consider how the health, education, and welfare of children in the stream of migrant workers that passes up this eastern coast during this season, how those services can be improved for those children.

Of course this type of thing is likely important, but it is being done now. Why start another group of Federal employees in this field when it is being handled in 7 or 8 different bureaus, departments, and agencies of the Government at the present time? If the Bureau of the Budget would say: "We are going to consolidate this activity in one agency," that would make sense to the committee.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that President Eisenhower recommended \$100,000 in his budget message to the House of Representatives?

Mr. BUSBEY. It is also true that \$185,000 was recommended in the budget in 1954 for this specific purpose. The committee disallowed it, the House disallowed it, and the Senate disallowed it last year.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. President Eisenhower must have had in mind some kind of an effort on the part of the National Government to assist the some 1 million migrant workers of the country.

Mr. BUSBEY. I hope that the House will stand by the committee and vote down this amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there is considerable merit in the proposition of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT]. I want to recall for the information of my colleagues an incident that happened in 1950 in the 81st Congress when I was conducting hearings at Government installations to determine Government responsibility that led to the drafting of Public Laws 815 and 874.

We were holding hearings in San Antonio, Tex. There is an area in north San Antonio occupied by migratory workers. I was surprised when I was checking up on their school enrollment and their school average daily attendance to find that 35 percent of the school population of that area were not in attendance at school. I was advised that they were out on their annual pilgrimage as migratory workers. Naturally I was forced to wonder what was happening to the education of those children if they were kept away from school and possibly taken into several adjoining States.

If the gentleman's proposal will provide some kind of method for educating those youngsters of migratory labor and provide other service to them where they are located, then I would consider there is merit in the gentleman's proposition.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The \$100,000 that we are attempting to write into this bill will make it possible for the Federal Government to gather all information as to how the several States handle this segment of our American population, and make the information available to all States.

Mr. BAILEY. Nobody appeared to be handling this situation in Texas.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. One State does it one way, while another State does it a different way. This amendment is for the purpose of coordinating the efforts of all States and will prove mutually beneficial to all of them.

Mr. BAILEY. I have no particular interest since it is not a problem of my State. My only interest is one of a general nature as a Member of the Congress.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. If this money were being expended for the education of the children I would be very much in favor of it. It might do some good to have these studies made; however, I think the Government has plenty of information now. We are having too many committees, too many commissions, making studies and nothing being done about them.

Mr. BAILEY. There is a problem there that does need attention.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to remind the members of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union that the Labor Department employs approximately 4,500 people. In this appropriation bill there are funds sufficient to employ in the Labor Department approximately 4,500 people. Of those 4,500 people, surely at least 10 or 15 of them could be spared to handle the migratory labor program.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize that there are a lot of farmers in America that would like to have and do employ migratory help, but I think we are loading this Government with too many commissions and agencies doing the same thing. The farmers of the Nation have been getting migratory help in sufficient quantities without setting up a new agency.

Again I say, Mr. Chairman, surely it is not necessary to appropriate an additional \$100,000 in this bill to carry on the work that is necessary to bring migratory labor to the farmers who need it when, as I said before, there are 4,500 people working in the Department of Labor, and this appropriation bill provides for approximately that many for fiscal year 1955. It would be a sad commentary on the part of the Labor Department if they are not able to carry on this migratory labor job in a very efficient manner with the help they now have. My recommendation is that they be instructed to just do that.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman said that this type of labor is being adequately taken care of. If that is so, then why did President Eisenhower include in his budget message to the Congress \$100,000 to set up the necessary machinery within the Department of Labor to coordinate this information so that it would be distributed to the several States?

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, I think it is quite possible that the President of the United States personally did not make that recommendation. That recommendation was made by the Department of Labor and, of course, when the budget comes to the Congress, which it does every session, and the budget requests so much for this and that, then, of course, it is natural and customary for people to say that the President of the United States recommends it. The President cannot know about all of the thousands of items recommended in the budget.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Assuming the President did not know about it; however the amount was recommended to him by the Secretary of Labor. The gentleman must agree that the Secretary of Labor had all the facts and recommended it.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes. Too often the heads of departments ask for everything, with a gold ring around it, with no consideration of the cost to the taxpayers.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

(Mr. O'KONSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Van Zandt amendment, and I do so for this special reason. This same appropriation bill which we are now discussing has in it, I believe, an item of \$1.5 million to take care of Mexican migratory workers. It also contains the item we are now discussing for a measly \$100,000 to take care of American migratory workers. In other words, this appropriation bill carries an item of appropriation of 15 times more for Mexican migratory workers than it does for American migratory workers. I cannot conceive this Congress passing a bill which says that Mexican migratory workers are 15 times more valuable than American migratory workers. This ratio of 15 to 1, in my judgment, cannot be justified.

For 25 years or more we have known of the need to improve the condition of these workers and their families who migrate from State to State to fill urgent seasonal agricultural labor requirements. Often they have no permanent residence which means that they do not have the normal benefits that a worker and his family who are settled in a community expect as a matter of course.

To meet the complicated economic and social problems of this migratory group is not easy for any State or local community. It is clear that many of the problems are interstate in character. The Federal Government, therefore, has a responsibility to give leadership and assistance to the State agencies, church, and citizen groups who want to act. It is to give the Labor Department the opportunity to do just this—help bring together the groups that want and can do something on a State and local level,

that the administration has requested this small sum of \$100,000 for the Labor Department to develop such a Federal-State approach to the problem. We are including in this bill over a million and a half to bring in Mexican nationals to meet agricultural labor needs. Who among you will want to face the church, civic, parent-teacher, and other groups in your State and say we could not afford \$100,000 for our own migratory citizens who more than any other group in this great country of ours need this help?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. In addition to the millions of dollars that we have appropriated for Mexican migratory workers, would not the gentleman add to his statement that as a nation we have appropriated millions of dollars to take care of undernourished people throughout the world?

Mr. O'KONSKI. That is correct. I cannot approve passing an appropriation bill at this time which contains an item in a ratio of 15-to-1 discriminating against American migratory workers. I cannot justify that kind of discrimination.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. I would like to state for the benefit of the gentleman that the money that is appropriated in this bill for the Mexican farm labor program is not appropriated for the benefit of Mexican labor. It is appropriated to recruit Mexican labor for the farmers who need this stoop-back labor in this country and cannot get it any place else. The crops would not be harvested unless we appropriated this money to recruit that Mexican farm labor.

Mr. O'KONSKI. But when you have such a ratio as 15-to-1, it means that we are spending 15 times more—you may call it a recruiting program if you like—to recruit this Mexican labor than you are spending for the benefit of the American migratory workers. I cannot justify that kind of discrimination.

Mr. BUSBEY. There is a great deal more than 15 times the number of Mexican farm laborers recruited and brought into this country than local migratory workers.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. When the opposition of the Appropriations Subcommittee to the Van Zandt amendment is on the ground that the President did not know about this item, even though it was contained in his message, would we not be put in the peculiar position of voting on whether or not President Eisenhower knew what he was talking about? I believe the amendment should be supported on the ground of the validity of the program, that it is needed for these migratory workers rather than on the question of whether the President knew what he was talking about when he included the item in his message.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

(Mr. SCOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCOTT. What impresses me, Mr. Chairman, as has already been brought out, is the fact that this \$100,000 is designed to help migratory workers of whom there are approximately 1 million, whereas the appropriation of \$1.5 million is to help farmers who are engaged in the employment of Mexican migrant labor which number, I believe, no more than 250,000.

I am impressed by the argument made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] to the effect that if we are going to take care of the Mexican migratory worker problem, we also ought to take care of the American migratory worker problem.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I think the gentleman is correct in his remarks, as is the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'Konski]. The gentleman's argument and the argument of the gentleman from Wisconsin clearly show that the trouble with this amendment is that the amount, \$100,000 for this purpose is utterly inadequate. If we are going to do a job, let us do a job. One hundred thousand dollars is just money thrown away on another commission.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. If the \$100,000 is inadequate, let the department come back here with another request for money.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Exactly. Let them come back and ask for a proper and adequate amount of money. When they do so, we will consider it.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, some of the arguments against this amendment certainly do not carry much weight. It was stated by one of the members of the committee in opposition to the amendment that the States have programs of this kind and that the Federal Government should not get into it. Let me say in answer to that that some States have had a program through the years, but not all States have had it.

In past years to some great extent the problem was one that was peculiarly a State problem, with maybe a little overlapping of the migration of farm workers from State to State, but they were American farm workers. In the past 10 years we have developed a Frankenstein that some people evidently do not know how to handle. With the importation in large numbers of Mexican workers, you no longer have just a single State problem, you have a national problem to the point of its being an international problem, one that is reaching into and creating complex and intricate social, crime, and juvenile delinquency problems in States that heretofore have had no problem with regard to their migratory farm labor. So today it is more necessary than ever before that the Federal Government cor-

relate the work of the States and gather and exchange information and experience from the several States for use of others.

The other argument was, "Of course, the President cannot know everything." No President can know all the details of all the departments of the Government, and no human being ever was born or, I am sure, ever will be born, that can know all the details of government. But under our system of government the President has the responsibility of appointing capable people, in whom he has confidence and in whom we are expected to have to a greater or lesser degree some confidence as to his making recommendations to the President. To use the argument that the President did not know what he was doing when he offered the \$100,000 recommendation is to say that the President of United States is appointing incompetent people to office. That statement might come from my side of the aisle but I was a little astounded to hear it come from the side of the aisle from which it did come.

We do spend in this bill \$1,500,000 to bring in Mexican farm labor. True, that money is for recruiting for the benefit of the big farmers in this country. Yet we are resisting an effort to spend \$100,000 for American farm workers.

Now let us take a look at the existing situation.

I am shocked and astounded by the action of the committee in denying the President's request for \$100,000 to do something for our domestic agricultural migrants. This is the second time that an effort for constructive action for these helpless citizens who are driven from State to State in an effort to earn a few paltry dollars has been denied. We boast about equality in this fair land of ours—equality of opportunity, equality before the law, equality of treatment. There is no such equality for the migratory farm workers who follow the crops. They are denied all of the protections and privileges which other workers enjoy. The facts are clear. They have been brought out in study after study, and most recently in the report of the President's Committee on Migratory Labor. But there has been no action on the recommendations. And now, when the administration proposes that we take certain feeble steps in the direction of an action program, the Appropriations Committee turns thumbs down. Why is this? What are we afraid of? Surely the expenditure of \$100,000, even by an economy-minded Congress, is not the stumbling block. The reasons advanced by the committee for refusing to allow this item are not convincing. There must be something more behind it.

Each year on this floor we hear arguments for bringing in Mexicans to harvest our crops. The bill we have before us today includes an item of \$1,521,000 for the Mexican farm labor program. The taxpayers of the United States are asked to subsidize the big farmers to the tune of \$1½ million to bring in foreign workers. In other words, we can afford to spend \$150 for each Mexican that is imported but we cannot afford 10 cents

to each domestic migrant to make life more attractive and American labor more readily available for farm work. If the Appropriations Committee was looking for real economy, this would be a good place to begin.

Let us look at the proposal of \$100,000 for the Department of Labor to provide leadership in establishing a cooperative Federal-State program for migrants. We all know that any improvement in the lot of migrant workers involves the cooperation of many agencies of Government—Federal and State. Without coordination of the work of these agencies little or nothing is done. The Labor Department proposes to give leadership in bringing these agencies together, particularly in the States, to study their migrant labor problems and jointly plan for their improvement. In the few places where such a joint approach has been made, real progress has resulted. The children of the migrant workers have been put in school; health needs have been met; housing has been improved and community acceptance has resulted. For the first time the migrant families have been treated like human beings to the benefit of all parties concerned—the farmers as well as the rest of the community.

Now, what is wrong with telling the rest of the country how these improvements were brought about? What community forces were enlisted? How they worked together, the strength of the various programs? It is part of the American tradition that we build from strength. If we tackle this problem as the Department of Labor proposes, we should mobilize the forces of all the people of good will in behalf of the submerged group in our population. There is no set pattern for such improvement. One plan may work here, another there. If we set our hearts and minds and our great talents to do something constructive for our migrant agricultural workers, I am confident we will get results. It takes leadership to get such a program underway. The Department of Labor is the agency to give that leadership and I hope and trust that Congress will give them the money to get going. This should have been done years ago. Further delay is unpardonable. Instead of showing faith in our people and in our democracy, the proposal again is to do nothing.

The recommendation of the President should be adopted and the amendment should be adopted. The Department of Labor should be given the instruments by which they can start to do something on this problem which day by day is becoming more and more serious in the various States. I ask that the amendment be approved.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VAN ZANDT) there were—ayes 45, noes 43.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BUSBEY and Mr. VAN ZANDT.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 77, nocs 81.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: Pages 2 and 3, strike out the paragraph beginning on page 2, line 18, and running through page 3, line 8, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS

"Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the promotion of industrial safety, employment stabilization, and amicable industrial relations for labor and industry; performance of safety functions of the Secretary under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (5 U. S. C. 784 (c)); performance of the functions vested in the Secretary by title I of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 159 (f) and (g)); and not less than \$75,000 for the work of the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, as authorized by the act of July 11, 1949 (63 Stat. 409), and provided further that no part of the appropriation for the President's Committee shall be subject to reduction or transfer to any other department or agency under the provisions of any existing law; including purchase of reports and of material for informational exhibits and expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at conferences concerned with the work of the Bureau of Labor Standards; \$665,000."

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, the committee will accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to conduct a program of encouraging apprentice training as authorized by the act of August 16, 1937 (29 U. S. C. 50), \$3,100,000.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TOLLEFSON: On page 3, line 24, after the comma, strike out "\$3,100,000" and insert "\$3,215,000."

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I am always reluctant to offer an amendment to increase an item in an appropriation bill, and in the years I have been a Member of Congress I have done so on only two other occasions. I felt I should do so in this case.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is designed to restore \$115,000 in appropriations for the Bureau of Apprenticeship in the Department of Labor. The estimates for fiscal 1955 were \$3,215,000, and the bill before us provides for \$115,000 less—or \$3,100,000.

The item involved is not large, and the program is not going to collapse without these additional funds. But it is going to be hurt to the extent that it will not be able to do the work it was designed to do, as well as it should do it.

Over the past few years the total funds for this program have been reduced, and

I am informed that the average annual reduction in force in this Department has been about 35 or 36. At the same time there has been an increase during the past 2 years in the number of apprentices trained.

As the Members of the House know, the apprenticeship training program is concerned with the training of an industrial work force, and is carried on in cooperation with State governments. Labor and management are encouraged and assisted to conduct training on the job—which they do in connection with the program.

The object is to provide skilled apprentices to replace workmen who annually drop out of employment because of age, disability, or death. The present rate of training does not keep up with the needs for replacement—even in a peacetime economy. In the event of mobilization for an emergency we would fall far short of having a sufficient nucleus of trained workers.

Lawrence Appley, chairman, Manpower Resources for National Security, stated:

There are not now in training enough apprentices to replace during the next 3 years the losses through death and retirements of machinists, tool and die makers, molders, patternmakers, boilermakers, and millwrights. These estimates are based upon continuing high levels of economic activity but do not include the potential requirements of a higher level mobilization.

In other words he says that even for peacetime needs we are falling behind in the job of training skilled workers. If an emergency breaks out we will be far short of our needs.

That being the case, the work of the Bureau of Apprenticeship in the Department of Labor should be broadened and stimulated, instead of being curtailed.

Mr. Chairman, the skilled work force of America is its greatest asset. Its importance to the national economy can be told with a single statistic: This country, with one-fifteenth of the world's people produces almost one-half of all manufactured goods. Behind every product manufactured in this country lies the work of skilled hands.

The President has set forth as a major national objective the maintenance of a strong and growing economy. The achievement of this objective will depend largely upon increasing skills and versatility in our work force. In the world today our position of strength and security can only be maintained by a continued growth in our ability to produce. Up until now our technical progress has permitted the use of workers of limited skills. But this same progress is now advancing to a stage where ever increasing requirements for skills are arising. To meet these new requirements for skills we must give attention to the training of our workers.

The Bureau of Apprenticeship of the United States Department of Labor, under mandate of Congress, has been stimulating the type of training necessary in industry. The introduction of new materials, machines and methods requires more and more training in industry. Supervision of workers is improved by

training. New occupations are arising in industry in fields such as electronics. Workers must be trained to enter these fields. If we are to have a versatile and competent work force, we must bring to bear every device for improving the efficiency and technical competency of our workers. The Bureau of Apprenticeship is in a position to assist greatly in persuading management, labor, States, and local communities to vigorous action in this field. This program of apprenticeship and other on-the-job training has had a unanimity of strong support from all management, labor, veterans' organizations, and public agencies. Its worth cannot be questioned. Any further diminution of the resources of the Bureau of Apprenticeship would have a halting effect on the training program in the United States.

Now is the time for us to build up the skills of our craftsmen so that we do not again find ourselves in an emergency with our production retarded by shortages of key workers in important industries. The President has submitted what I feel are modest estimates to continue the excellent program of maintaining and increasing the skills of our work force. A cut no matter how small, in the appropriations for the Bureau of Apprenticeship, means a reduction of the services of this agency to American industry. I opposed a cut in this appropriation last year and I wish to again oppose it. I propose that the President's estimate of \$3,215,000 be restored.

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

(Mr. REAMS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Chairman, during the past 16 years the Bureau of Apprenticeship has been a substantial factor in having ready at all times a group of skilled workers to man the shops and to carry on the construction and building trades of this country.

There is a false understanding abroad which has made many people believe that mechanization has displaced skilled workers; that the robot can do the work of the journeyman. Nothing could be further from the fact. There has been a great advance in mechanization. Many operations are of the pushbutton type. This does take the place of a considerable amount of unskilled labor. Actually, more mechanized industry means an increased need for skilled workers. Intricate machines are of no value without highly trained people to operate them.

Skilled workers for the trades are prepared in two ways. The first method, which was the practice throughout the decades when the great American industrial potential was being developed, was for employees to assign to each journeyman or senior skilled worker an apprentice, usually known as a helper. These helpers frequently started to work very young. By the time they attained maturity helping the mechanic, the bricklayer, the carpenter, they had acquired skill in proportion to their ability and

diligence. In modern industry it is not practicable, and almost impossible, to train apprentices in this manner.

The method which has proved most efficient in this era of industry is to train apprentices under a program in which the Bureau of Apprenticeship of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the local boards of education, labor, and management cooperate.

In my city of Toledo, Ohio, a total of 106 construction industry apprentices were recently graduated to journeyman status. Apprentices who received the certificates included 16 bricklayers, 36 carpenters, 9 electricians, 7 automatic heating workers, 4 ironworkers, 2 cement masons, 7 painters, 11 plumbers, and pipefitters, 2 roofers, and 12 sheetmetal workers. This was for the construction division. There are also apprenticeship classes in other branches of industry.

For the high-school graduates who can afford to go to college for further training there are many avenues open. Public money for operation for institutions of higher learning and privately granted scholarships pave the way for those fortunate enough and with a desire for higher learning in the arts, sciences, professions, and business administration. But to the vast group of young people who desire to go into a trade the task is more difficult today. It is not easy to get a job, as in the past, to learn the trade in the shop unless we help encourage an apprenticeship program through the public-school system and the vocational education program. The shortage of skilled workers will continue. Whenever an emergency arises there is a great pressure to hire all available workers with skills. Then there is a hue and cry against pirating of workmen and a demand for manpower control and wage control. National production suffers from these methods.

I urge the Members of this House to restore the \$115,000 which has been taken from the appropriation for 1954. We must continue to give these young men opportunities for apprentice training. It is simple justice to them and it is always farsighted and frugal to have an adequate supply of trained workers prepared to expand the industry of the Nation.

Educators, veterans' organizations, labor groups are all industrial leaders, are all sincerely concerned and vitally interested in restoring to this bill this amount by which it has been reduced in committee.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

Mr. Chairman, I concur in what the gentleman from Ohio said in regard to the worthwhileness of this program. I noted that the gentleman from Washington said something about the necessity of this apprenticeship program for the shipbuilding industry. I am also well aware of that situation.

Mr. Chairman, about 2 weeks ago, the House passed the Defense Department appropriation bill. I do not recall the amount of money involved, but there was a substantial sum for the Navy to

use in expanding its apprenticeship training program. The apprenticeship program, as it is now constituted in the States, is not the only apprenticeship program, because our defense departments carry on apprenticeship programs, and other programs are independently carried on in various industries.

The money in this bill is for the pay of Federal employees. The States do not receive 1 cent of the money.

Certainly, \$115,000 taken out of this bill is not a reduction in the program at all, and I will tell you why. As the programs progressed under the supervision of the Federal Government, it was the intent of the law that labor and management in the States would assume more and more of the responsibilities for program operations. Since they have been doing this, I do not believe that cutting \$115,000 from this program will hurt one bit.

The States are also assuming more responsibilities in this program. Let me refer you to page 106 of the hearings where I asked Mr. Patterson the following question:

What have these 28 States appropriated for the operation of their State apprenticeship agencies during the current fiscal year?

Mr. PATTERSON. We have found difficulty in getting the States' actual figures because we, like any Federal agency, should be careful about poking our noses into their business, but we find there are 177 full-time technical field representatives who were employed during the last fiscal year.

Mr. BUSBEY. That is, for the fiscal year 1953.

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes; the fiscal year ended last July.

I will not read it all but you will note, from the rest of his testimony, that this was an increase over 1952, and that he believed there would be an increase in 1954 over 1953.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Is it not a fact that this reduction, which is substantially greater than the reduction proposed last year, will mean the loss from the staff of the Bureau of Labor Apprenticeship of nearly 40 trained men; that is, it will result in 40 trained men being removed from the staff of the Bureau of Labor Apprenticeship?

Mr. BUSBEY. Well, if the statement of the gentleman were correct, that means that their average salary would be about \$2,500 a year; and I do not believe any of these people are working for \$2,500 a year.

If I may pursue this just a little further, this \$115,000 divided between 51 States and Territories, and Puerto Rico, would mean what? An average of about \$2,000 worth of Federal personnel. Of course, most of this program is in the large industrial States. Two thousand dollars, mind you. I do not believe the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, and a lot of the others are going to let their apprenticeship programs suffer too much for that kind of money.

They should be doing more of it. The labor unions and management are doing a great deal in this respect. They are

assuming more responsibility every year, and I think they should assume even more responsibility, not only to take the burden off the Federal Government, but for a better program.

Now I am going to make note of the fact that, so far, the two amendments to increase the committee's recommendations have been made from the Republican side of the House. I do not know if that is by design or not, but I think we will be in very bad shape, all of us, if we start increasing these bills; and then go back into our districts this fall in the campaign and try to tell the people how much we are for economy.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the committee, in making a cut of this kind, should give better justification for its action than the chairman of the subcommittee has given here this afternoon. He has agreed that apprentice training program is a most worthwhile program. He seems to agree that the apprenticeship program must be continued, but then he says in the name of economy this cut must be accepted. He suggests that the Republicans are offering these amendments possibly after some discussion with the Democrats. He does not explain the significance of this.

I do not think that is the important consideration. What we ought to keep in mind is that in the present state of our economy and in the present state of international affairs, it is of importance to keep this program which does give flexibility to our labor program, which does provide a means for increasing the potential production of our labor force. We should keep this program working at maximum efficiency. In addition to that, we should keep in mind that whereas this policy of having the States assume greater responsibility is perhaps a defensible policy. The State legislatures have not yet had a chance to act to take up the slack in this and other programs for which Federal contributions have been reduced.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. It is also true that a large portion of our industrial labor is interstate in nature and moves from place to place, and standards should therefore, be universal across the country. Specific States should not be responsible for this training, it would seem to me, in those industries.

Mr. McCARTHY. The gentleman from Oklahoma is correct. Much of the emergency supply of labor in the course of the last war and in the course of the Korean difficulty was drawn from rural areas of the country in which we do not or did not have large industrial establishments. Consequently, Federal support of this kind should be continued.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I wonder if the gentleman has any figures on the num-

ber of personnel who will actually be affected if this cut of \$130,000 below the 1954 appropriation does go into effect. I have information, which I believe is reliable, that close to 40 people will be cut from the payroll of this organization, reducing its efficiency thereby, if this reduction goes into effect.

Mr. McCARTHY. The estimate that I received was somewhere between 30 and 40. I do not have an exact figure.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCARTHY. I certainly urge the Members of the House, therefore, to give to the Department of Labor at least what it requested in this case, and to support the amendment.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I simply would like to call the attention of the Committee of the Whole House to the fact that the committee's recommendation of \$3,100,000 was \$400,000 larger than the appropriation for this work in the fiscal year 1953. The present program for 1954 is the largest in the history of the program. The reduction which has been made here could not possibly affect more than 20 people. It is a reduction in salaries and if there is any area in which the people of the United States would like to see us save a little money it is in the salary items, items which are not direct-action items.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. TOLLEFSON) there were ayes 44, and noes 50.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

The Clerk read as follows:

WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for performing the duties imposed by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, and the act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, approved June 30, 1936, as amended (41 U. S. C. 35-45), including reimbursement to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for inspection services rendered, and not to exceed \$3,000 for expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at conferences concerned with the work of the Division, \$6 million.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CORBETT: On page 10, line 6, strike out "\$6,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$6,233,000."

(Mr. CORBETT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I propose is a simple change in the amount of money provided for the Wage and Hour Division. The bill asks for \$6 million. The amendment asks that that figure be increased to \$6,233,000, which is the identical figure recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

The amount appropriated for 1954 was \$6,250,000.

The important point here is that this reduction of \$233,000 seems to be slight until you recall that there have been successive reductions every fiscal year since fiscal 1951, when there was appropriated for this bureau \$9,396,000. Now we have reached the point where the money involved has been decreased over 33 percent to \$6 million. This has resulted in a reduction of the investigators in this bureau from over 1,000 to approximately 500.

This bureau has a very vital job of enforcing one of the most basic labor policies that have ever been written by this Congress, namely, that with respect to minimum wages and maximum hours. We have a bureau which is called on to investigate over 700,000 industries covered by the act and is faced with the job of examining approximately 35,000 new concerns every year. It presently is able to visit only approximately 5 to 7 percent of all the concerns covered by the act.

The net result is and must be that the concerns which have done a fine job of living up to the letter of the law are suffering unfair competition from those who are paying less than the minimum wage or employing people beyond the maximum number of hours.

It seems to me self-evident that if we are going to have a bureau do a job of preventing violations of the law we must have enough individuals to do the job. In my home city of Pittsburgh the field office supervisory staff consists of 1 man and 1 secretary, trying to supervise investigators throughout the whole of western Pennsylvania.

To me, it seems absolutely essential that we do a much better job of preventing violations of this law in order to protect those people who operate decent, law-abiding concerns. Further, we recognize that, insofar as these laws are violated, it is obvious that lower salaries are resulting and unemployment is increasing.

So, Mr. Chairman, I sincerely urge that this committee restore to this measure the amount of money which the budget recommended, so that the Bureau can then work more efficiently to enforce the law as the Congress wants it enforced.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Is it not true that the Department is not able to process new business concerns that start every year? I understand there is about a 35,000 turnover every year, and they cannot process them.

Mr. CORBETT. The gentleman is absolutely correct. Thirty-five thousand industries scattered all over the United States are just too many to be properly supervised; and when you get into the matter of trying to bring minimum wages up to standard in Puerto Rico, we have apparently failed to bring them up to a fair, competitive position.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I, too, feel that the proposed cut in the Wage and Hour Division should not stand, although I am strong for economy. I believe that the Division has gotten down to a rock-bottom operating basis, if not lower, and that serious consideration should be given to increasing rather than decreasing the budget. I am especially concerned about the effect of the cut on the wages in Puerto Rico. We in New England are very much concerned by the increasing competition from Puerto Rico and the slow progress being made by the Department in raising the wage levels in Puerto Rico. I greatly fear that with another cut in the budget it will mean the slowing down of this program rather than increasing it, as I think should be done.

Mr. Chairman, recently there was sent from Lowell, Mass., to the President of the United States a petition containing 20,000 names asking for help for the textile industry. You know goods made in Puerto Rico affect industry very much. There is a very large number of names on the petition which has come in for me to present to the President. I earnestly hope that the gentleman's amendment will be adopted. It will help to prevent unemployment. I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] for presenting it.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I would like to call attention to the fact that the appropriation for the fiscal year 1955 is more than the Wage and Hour Division had in any year up to 1950 and is almost exactly equal to that year's appropriation.

If you will refer to the hearings for a moment, you will find, on page 278, that Mr. McComb, the head of the Wage and Hour Division, says:

As a result of such changes, it is expected that the Division may attain the same level of program during 1954 as we did in 1953 even though we have a smaller staff. During fiscal year 1953 the Division completed 42,768 investigations of which 38,649 were made in industrial establishments and 4,119 were investigations of child labor in agriculture.

They have kept the level up to 1953, even with the reduction of \$1,400,000 which Congress made in their 1954 budget. If you will turn further to page 287, you will see where I read from Mr. McComb's prepared statement, as follows:

A study is being made as to the advisability of extending the recently adopted condensed reporting procedure to be used in violation and restitution cases as well as in no-violation cases. This study is being directed particularly to present investigation techniques concerning interviews and transcriptions.

Plans are being formulated to obtain data for the establishment of comprehensive employer files in all regional offices to assist in the planning and scheduling aspects of the investigation program.

A study is contemplated to determine the feasibility of using dictating or similar equipment in the development and preparation of investigation case-file material, particularly with respect to the preparation of narrative reports.

These studies will result in further savings in the future, I am confident. So you see, when they came in with crocodile tears on the floor last year when the cut of \$1,400,000 was being considered, they were completely wrong. I have no hesitancy in saying that this Division, with this total cut of \$233,000 for 1955, will be able to carry on their investigations and work as well as, if not better than, they are during fiscal 1954.

I hope the amendment is rejected.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I rise in support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the Appropriations Committee has tried to do a conscientious job on this appropriation bill. I will support most of the recommendations made by the committee; however, I do not feel that I can go along with this cut for the Wage and Hour Division, a cut of \$233,000 under the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget. The Wage and Hour Division is an agency that has responsibility for administering and enforcing our national minimum wage law. Last year as a result of a cut of about 25 percent the Division had to close 21 field offices. This has reduced seriously the service the Division renders to both labor and management throughout the country. If another cut is imposed, I would anticipate that they would have to close some more field offices. I think we should restore this cut. This Division is equally beneficial to business and labor. Inadequate enforcement of this act allows the chiselers to benefit to the detriment of the legitimate business.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT]. As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor in the 81st Congress, it was my pleasure to sponsor the legislation that came out of a rather tumultuous committee, to increase the minimum wage from 40 cents to 75 cents an hour. I recall that in the discussions leading to the reporting of this legislation, information taken in our hearings was to the effect that we would include 3½ million additional people under coverage, which would greatly enlarge the activities and responsibilities of the Wage and Hour Division in the Labor Department.

Last year I joined in the protest against the \$1,400,000 cut in this appropriation, and I am opposed to the \$233,000 reduction proposed in the present bill. I think the activities have been so enlarged and the field so enlarged that this is necessary. I might add for the information of my colleague that in this particular case this bureau in the Labor Department is a collection agency for all the people in the country who have suits brought to enforce payment of legal wages under the minimum wage law. It is a very responsible department and I do not think its activities should be curtailed.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, I operate a small business which, under various interpretations, at various times, has been under this wages and hours legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I must say that I am impressed by the doubts raised by my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT], regarding this proposed cut in the budget of the Wage and Hour Division. While the total amount may not seem large, it comes on top of a whole series of cuts during the past 3 years, including approximately a 25-percent cut last year.

I am fearful that if this cut goes through as proposed, the Division may be forced to close down a number of field offices with the result that they will be unable to furnish advice and assistance in some of the major areas of the country to the people who must comply with the Fair Labor Standards Act and the Walsh-Healey Act.

If the wages and hours legislation is to continue in force, it must be applied equally and universally to all enterprises concerned. Lack of counseling and lack of enforcement facilities will work undue hardship on the firms complying with the act which will react to their disadvantage in a competitive situation. The hardship which lack of counseling and enforcement facilities would work on employees seems to me to be obvious. I urge that an amendment to increase this appropriation by \$233,000 be supported to restore the appropriation to the agency request level as approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment proposed by my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT], to add \$100,000 to the appropriation for the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor. The function of the Wage and Hour Division is an important and integral part of Labor Department operations. The tasks imposed by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 cannot be carried out except for the existence of the Wage and Hour Division. The amount of \$100,000 proposed against a field of astronomical sums used to operate the Government is inconsequential. My colleague's amendment is a meritorious one and will strengthen this division so it can more effectually obtain compliance with our labor laws and increase the efficiency of the Department.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

(Mr. SCOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT]. This is in line with the proposal of, and exactly the amount of money which has been requested by, this administration for the purpose of ad-

ministering the Department of Labor, a minimum amount, an amount which is considerably less than and which represents a considerable savings over the past few years in line with this administration's promises of economy and efficient administration. But it does represent what they state to be the absolute minimum necessary for fair and equitable enforcement.

Mr. Chairman, your party is justly proud of the fact that under Republican administrations most Cabinet offices of comparatively recent date were established with Cabinet rank: The Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, I believe; the Department of Commerce, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. We established those departments because there was a real need for them. Then the people of this country elected a President who undertook to administer, to regulate, and to enforce the laws passed which would come under the administrative responsibility of the particular department involved. This is one of those instances; this is an instance where it seems to me that the support of the administration is involved.

The administration's request is reasonable and it is believed to be necessary. In my part of the country industry for the most part finds very little trouble getting along with this act. Our people obey the law for the most part, and if they do not we want enforcement to see that they do. We also want to make sure that other sections of the country obey the Federal wage-hour laws, and we cannot do that unless we have adequate and sufficient funds.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. I want to say to the gentleman that I appreciate his intelligent statement.

I wish to take advantage of this opportunity to correct the figures I gave in my opening remarks. Actually, rather than a decrease of the employees in the Department from 1,000 to 500, that is a decrease in the number of actual investigators, and I know the gentleman shares this view, we have cut this Department down to the point where any further cuts are right into the bone itself, I certainly appreciate the gentleman's support. I hope the amendment prevails.

Mr. SCOTT. I echo the gentleman's sentiment.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The Department of Labor protects and promotes the welfare of wage and salary earners now numbering more than 47 million in the United States.

This Department is, at the same time, the smallest in the Federal Government. After some 40 years of continued existence the Department has less than 5,000 employees. The next Government agency in size is the Department of State, a relative giant of more than 20,000 employees.

The quality or the amount of service rendered by any organization, Government or not, does not necessarily depend upon the size of the organization. However, the Labor Department's employees are spread pretty thin over their huge job, which includes policymaking legislation, enforcement, and promotion of decent labor standards.

In his first state of the Union message President Eisenhower said his administration "intends to strengthen and to improve the services which the Department of Labor can render to the worker and to the whole national community."

Congress has proceeded to slash the Department, cutting its personnel to the lowest point since its establishment.

The appropriation bill Congress passed in the first session slashed the Labor Department's operating expenses 14 percent and lopped 9 percent off the Eisenhower revised budget.

That 14 percent overall cut did not come down evenly to the 10 bureaus and divisions of the Department. Some got hit harder than others.

Particularly singled out for cuts were the Wage and Hour Administration, the Apprenticeship Division, the Bureau of Labor Standards, the Office of the Solicitor, and the Office of the Secretary.

The attack on the Wage and Hour Division and the Solicitor's Office was a considered attempt to cripple enforcement of the Wages and Hours Act and the Walsh-Healey and the Davis-Bacon Acts.

Less money and fewer personnel mean less enforcement. Less enforcement of the Walsh-Healey Act and the Fair Labor Standards Act gives unscrupulous companies an advantage over concerns that try to be fair to their workmen doing Government contract work. Such an advantage can only work to encourage further disregard of these laws, since it puts a premium on law violation.

In the bill before us the attack continues. The Wage and Hour Division is reduced \$250,000 from an already inadequate appropriation. The Bureau of Labor Standards is expected to maintain safety standards after having a budget cut of \$138,000 in the appropriation bill passed last year, and now suffering an additional cut of \$45,000 from the appropriation for 1954. Such a meritorious program as that administered by the Bureau of Apprenticeship suffers a further decrease of \$130,000 from the amount available in the 1954 appropriation.

Contrast the Department of Labor, with 5,000 employees, with its opposite number, the Department of Commerce. Commerce employs more than 41,000.

By refusing the money necessary to proper growth, this Congress so far has tried to keep this "baby" Department just that, a weakling unable to protect the maintenance of decent working conditions, unable to protect both honest contractors and workers against chisellers.

This bill would appropriate \$298,700,000 for the Department for 1955. That is down \$11½ million from appropriations for this fiscal year and \$931,000 under the budget request. This would

continue to whittle away at the Department.

There are those who would destroy organized labor. They could help this cause by allowing the Labor Department to die on the vine thus accomplishing by indirection what they have not the courage to try by direct attack. One measure of how well they are getting on with their work will be what happens to the Labor Department appropriation in this session of Congress.

(Mr. METCALF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and do so simply to invite attention of the Committee of the Whole House to the fact that the reduction made in this budget item this year is the smallest reduction by committee action that has been made in many years, going clear back to 1945 and coming up to date. In past years the committee has cut this particular budget request substantially more than the committee did this year.

I sincerely believe that the Department can well absorb what is actually a very modest cut and much less than the Department has experienced at the hands of Appropriations Committees in previous years.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I share the views expressed by my colleagues on this matter of budget for the Wage and Hour Division. I know that this Division has laid off hundreds of investigators during the past few years as a result of cuts made by Congress. I have gone along with these cuts because I felt that it was imperative to balance the budget. I think, however, that we have reached the stage where the Division's work will be seriously crippled by what amounts to a process of slow strangulation. We must consider that this reduction is added on to a cut of about a million and a half dollars last year, another million dollars the year before, and some \$800,000 the year before that. You cannot go on cutting an agency year after year when its workload is increasing rather than decreasing. I think there are too few investigations being made even now because of the loss of these hundreds of investigators. It is not fair to the overwhelming majority of honest businessmen who voluntarily comply with these labor laws if we cannot assure them that a small chiseling minority will be brought into line. Nor is it fair to the man who wants to comply, thousands of them small-business men, to be unable to give him advice when he needs it. The primary job of these investigators, as I see it, is to help bring the requirements of these acts to the attention of businessmen so that there will not be inadvertent violations. I understand the number of investigators has been reduced from about 1,000 to less than 500 during the past 3 or 4 years. When you spread these 500 investigators around a work force of 60 million, and 750,000 covered establishments they represent the bare minimum necessary for good enforcement. I shall vote, Mr. Speaker, to restore this proposed cut for this agency.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CORBETT) there were—ayes 42, noes 54.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BUSBEY and Mr. CORBETT.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 68, noes 84.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses for carrying out the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 301-392); the Tea Importation Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 41-50); the Import Milk Act (21 U. S. C. 141-149); the Federal Caustic Poison Act (15 U. S. C. 401-411); and the Filled Milk Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 61-64); reporting and illustrating the results of investigations; purchase of chemicals, apparatus, and scientific equipment; not to exceed \$2,000 for payment in advance for special tests and analyses by contract; and payment of fees, travel, and per diem in connection with studies of new developments pertinent to food and drug enforcement operations; \$5,100,000.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

A STINGY FOOD AND DRUG BUDGET MEANS POISONED AMERICANS

Mr. Chairman, if I thought there was any chance of persuading the House on this issue today, I would certainly submit an amendment to restore the \$100,000 slashed from the budget of the Food and Drug Administration, and as a matter of fact, I would go further than that and try to restore the additional half million dollars taken from the Food and Drug Administration last year. I am terribly disappointed that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Bureau of the Budget have asked this year for only as much money as the Congress voted for the Food and Drug Administration last year, even though that meant the elimination of 80 positions in the agency.

I am not submitting an amendment today because I have been convinced by members of the subcommittee that it will not be entertained and supported. I hope the Senate will show a greater understanding of the issues involved here. In the meantime I would like to call to the attention of the House the dreadful disservice we do the American people—the consumers of this country—by a constant nibbling away at the pitifully small appropriations provided each year for food and drug inspection. This agency is our protection against poisonous, adulterated, filthy, nauseating materials shipped in interstate commerce for human consumption.

The budget this year provides only \$5,100,000 for the agency which is to protect our health from this kind of poisonous material. The committee has cut this, as I say, pitifully small appropriation by \$100,000. The people who will be poisoned this year as a result of inadequate food and drug inspection will

not be very impressed by a \$100,000 saving in the Federal Government's 60 or 70 billion dollars of expenditures in this coming fiscal year.

This is not economy; this is just plain ordinary stinginess—miserly penny-pinching at the expense of the health of our consumers.

I have been looking over a recent monthly report of the Food and Drug Administration for the month of April. In that month 700,000 pounds of food unfit for human consumption were removed from the market by Food and Drug agents. Mr. Chairman, every Member of this House should be glad that he did not have any of that food served to him.

One case in Philadelphia involved 300,000 cans of food being disposed of in a so-called warehouse fire sale. The fire had occurred 3 years ago. Many of the cans were rusty and had started to leak. The labels were virtually illegible. You could not tell what the cans contained or who put them out. Until the Food and Drug Administration stepped in, this rotten, filthy stuff was being sold to unwary housewives as is without any thought to the possible consequences. In another case in which the agency took criminal action, a seafood canner was fined \$1,200 for putting out decomposed shrimp and crabmeat packed under insanitary conditions. Are you not glad you did not eat any of that?

Products like these can cause serious illness. They can cause death—and it is a horrible way to die. Anyone who has ever had even a touch of ptomaine poisoning knows what this sort of thing can do. And how about adulterated drugs—drugs prescribed by the doctor in good faith or sold by the druggist in good faith which may kill rather than cure the patient. Is it worth saving \$100,000 in Federal funds if it means taking a chance on letting more of this stuff get into interstate commerce? I do not think so.

Last year the Congress passed an amendment to the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act closing a loophole discovered by the Supreme Court and restoring the right of Food and Drug inspectors to go into plants and see what is going on. I appreciate the support the House gave to that bill. But what protection have we given the consumer through passage of legislation of that kind if we do not provide sufficient inspectors to do the job properly. At the present rate of operations—before we take away this additional \$100,000 a year—it would take our Food and Drug inspectors 12 years to inspect each of the plants coming under its jurisdiction. It is supposed to cover about 96,000 plants and warehouses. It can touch only about one-tenth of 1 percent of this assignment.

Yet the average family spends about one-fourth of its entire income for products should be subject to Food and Drug inspection—products valued at about \$50 billion. With only about 200 inspectors that means each man is responsible for about a quarter of a billion dollars worth of merchandise.

I will not go into detail today as I did a year ago on the types and varieties of methods used to cheat and swindle the public on food products—horsemeat sold for beef, dried vegetables made to look like frozen vegetables, poultry pumped full of water and frozen. There are all sorts of tricks in the trade. Only a small portion of the FDA's time can be devoted to this kind of detective work. Important as this is, I think we are much more concerned about the adulterated and diseased and unfit food products shipped in interstate commerce. We spend twice as much on meat inspection as we do on the inspection of all other food and drug and cosmetic items. On a dollar basis that means we spend 12 times as much in making sure that a dollar's worth of meat products is pure and wholesome as we do in making sure that a dollar's worth of food, drugs, and cosmetics is pure, wholesome, and safe to use. Diseased poultry is one of our big problems. The Agriculture Department does not inspect poultry except at the request of the packer. A processor of diseased poultry is not going to request such inspection and pay for it, so it is up to the Food and Drug Administration to catch this poisonous material and get it off the market.

What we need is not merely a restoration of this \$100,000 to the Food and Drug budget or even the additional half million dollars by which its level of operations was reduced last year. What we need, Mr. Chairman, is a recognition on the part of the Congress and of the administration of the vital role of this agency in protecting the health of all the people. In this appropriation bill we are appropriating many millions for research on diseases afflicting our population.

It seems to me we should be able to afford a reasonable amount to keep healthy people from being poisoned by spoiled or adulterated food.

One further word: In order to conserve the time of the House, I do not intend to speak on any of the other appropriation items, but I do want to declare my support for the amendment which Mr. Fogarty of Rhode Island plans to submit on the vocational rehabilitation item. And in this connection, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say how much I appreciate the eloquent statement he made yesterday on this very matter of the Food and Drug Administration and the excellent work they do. I would also like to call to the attention of the House an item from one of the St. Louis labor newspapers on the subject of diseased poultry being sold to the public:

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Union Labor Advocate of June 4, 1954]

PUBLIC SOLD DISEASED POULTRY, SAYS BUTCHERS

(As has been reported on numerous occasions in the Advocate, that: Congresswoman LEONOR SULLIVAN from Missouri, in last year's session of Congress, made a strong fight for a watchful Food and Drug Administration, to protect the Nation's health. Below is cited why a vigilant and alert FDA is necessary.)

CHICAGO.—Charges that Federal inspection of poultry in many cases is a sham and that

poultry products reach the market from some concerns in diseased condition were made in the June issue of the Butcher Workman.

IT'S A CRIME

Earl W. Jimerson, president, and Patrick E. Gorman, secretary-treasurer of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, said in the issue, "We have in our possession countless affidavits from employees in poultry plants throughout the United States which is quite conclusive that thousands of chickens sometimes in one plant will pass on the line of production so diseased that it is a crime to permit their sale to the public.

"Other affidavits would indicate that some concerns will purchase diseased and even dead chickens for processing and that these products, because of poor State and Federal laws, are sold as fresh products, sometimes bear the stamp of approval of both Government and State departments of agriculture."

They also said that they are taking the fight into States. Bills will be proposed, too, in every State legislature to guard the public against diseased chickens not shipped interstate.

"Many poultry concerns," they said, "send their products in eye-appealing packages and these packages bear the supposed approval of the United States Department of Agriculture. This approval is given under subsection B of the seven Federal grading and inspection services in which poultry producers may participate."

WATCH THE FINE PRINT

"Subsection B does not pertain to the slaughtering of poultry at all but has merely to do with certain sanitary setups without respect to slaughtering. This type of Government recognition merely gives the right for the users to stamp their poultry as 'processed under U. S. D. A. Sanitary Standards.' Then, in very fine print which an unsuspecting public never read, the following: 'Not U. S. D. A. Graded for Quality or U. S. D. A. Inspected for Wholesomeness.'"

Hundreds of thousands of pounds reach the market diseased. Jimerson and Gorman quoted section A of the act which provides that "The service that is rendered under sanitation is limited only to sanitation. We do not have authority to prohibit a company from packing birds that may be emaciated or show external evidence of disease."

(Mrs. SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD just prior to the vote which the Committee last took.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, last year this Congress cut the appropriation for the Food and Drug Administration and saved less than half a cent apiece to American taxpayers—a saving that has curtailed the inspection work which FDA can do and thereby increased our risk of eating filth.

In the words of the FDA Commissioner the work of his agency was, prior to the cut, "already inadequate in fields relating directly to health." For example, under its fiscal 1953 appropriation, Food and Drug could assign only 20 inspectors to the grain trade. Approximately 1 billion bushels of wheat are moved in a typical crop year. This handful of FDA inspectors could check only a frac-

tion of 1 percent of the total moved and stored. Meanwhile the public was misled, thinking we had a full Government sanitation program.

This may not be very appetizing, but I feel that it should be called to your attention. Every day last year the Food and Drug Administration seized an average of 27 tons of filthy food that was headed for the market.

Lest you think the FDA was too finicky, let me cite some examples: A grain company was shipping macaroni enriched with the bodies of insects and rodent leavings. A shipment of canned peas was found to be 26 percent bugs. The largest seizure of the year was 2 million pounds of rodent-defiled sugar.

There also were canned rotten tomatoes. Rotten pickles that were ground up to make relish. Turkeys that had been sick and died and then were cooked and canned.

During the first half of last year, our Government seized 40 carloads of grain contaminated with excessive rat leavings. Under heavy pressure, the Administration decided to abandon inspection and merely study the matter. Meanwhile, we ate at least part of this grain.

In a recent report, FDA tells of seizing more than 262,000 pounds of food consisting of "filthy or decomposed grains and cereal products, butter, eggs, seafood, spices, fruit and vegetables, poultry and nuts."

And this was with a staff cut by the decreased appropriation.

Sixty-seven positions were abolished last year. Of these, 36 were professional employees—inspectors, analysts, doctors, veterinarians and experts in the Food and Drug law. The other 31 were clerical employees—including laboratory helpers and examiners. Three subdistrict laboratories and four resident inspection stations were closed.

What has happened as a result? FDA Commissioner C. W. Crawford puts it this way:

All this means that to fulfill our obligations to protect health we must ignore all but the most flagrant economic cheats, and curtail to some extent our work against filth and decomposition. Progress in the formulation of food standards will suffer, too, for a substantial amount of field study is required before proposals can be developed for hearing.

Yet this bill provides \$5,100,000 for the Food and Drug Administration next year, a reduction of \$100,000 from both the request and the appropriation for 1954.

This cut must necessarily result in further curtailment of the drive against filth and decomposition. We will have new complaints from housewives, who cannot stand the thought that they might be feeding decomposed food to their children, or that they might be using cosmetics which injure their skin and eyes. I believe the Food and Drug Administration inspection program should be enlarged instead of cut back.

(Mr. METCALF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Promotion and further development of vocational education: For carrying out the

provisions of section 3 of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20 U. S. C. 15), section 4 of the act of March 10, 1924 (20 U. S. C. 29), section 1 of the act of March 3, 1931 (20 U. S. C. 30), and the act of March 18, 1950 (Public Law 462), \$18,374,511: *Provided*, That the apportionment to the States under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 shall be computed on the basis of not to exceed \$18,199,511 for the current fiscal year: *Provided further*, That not more than \$450,000 of this appropriation shall be available for vocational education in distributive occupations.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 14, line 19, strike out "\$18,374,511" and insert "\$23,673,261."

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the few times that I can recall that I have offered an amendment to increase an appropriation bill. I feel deeply that this is a most important matter. We all realize that in America our school population is rapidly increasing. It is incumbent upon us to see that we meet the challenge of getting our people properly educated, that they might receive proper training to go forth in this world, to make better citizens of themselves in order that we might have a better place to live in.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would increase funds for vocational training by only \$5 million over and above the amount appropriated for fiscal 1954—from \$18,673,261 to \$23,673,261. I would like to point out that even with this increase which I believe to be entirely merited, the appropriation will still be nearly \$6 million less than the amount authorized by the George-Barden Act which the Congress approved in 1946. This act authorizes the appropriation of \$29,300,000 for vocational education. When this act was approved in 1946 there was every indication that it was the intent of Congress that the full amount would be appropriated within several years, but I would like to point out at this time that the largest amount ever made available in any year was in 1951 when \$19,977,760 was approved.

Last year we witnessed here on the floor of the House a demonstration of the faith which we hold in this program. You will recall that at that time the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare had reduced its request for vocational education by \$4 million only to have \$2 million of this restored by the Appropriations Committee. By action of the House we restored the allowance for vocational education to the amount appropriated the year before. This action I might add, was a boost to the vocational program, not alone because of the money involved but rather because it meant that we as Members of the House endorsed the work being done by these faithful people throughout the country.

My reason for introducing this amendment is because I believe that the demand for vocational training throughout the Nation is now greater than it has ever been in a peacetime period. Many vocational schools have long waiting lists of students who would like to enroll. There simply is not enough money available to employ a satisfactory number of

teachers to handle the program. The cost of teaching personnel has been increased to such an extent that even with the same amount of money they are actually able to put less teachers in the schools. Sometime ago the Governor of every State was contacted regarding the minimum requirements for educational teaching personnel in order to provide the type program which is needed. The replies which were received indicated that the Governors of the States which replied foresee a need of an additional 15,652 teachers. There are at present 32,594 teachers in the program and the addition of the necessary 15,652 would greatly enlarge the highly important work being rendered in this field.

Of course, Federal aid cannot do the job alone. The vocational people make no pretense of this, nor do I. Federal aid in itself is only what the George-Barden Act intended that it should be—to provide an initiative for expansion of effort by State and local governments. Today, we have enrolled throughout the country 3,100,139 students in vocational courses. Of these, 755,293 are in vocational agriculture, 249,012 in distributive education, 1,327,285 in home economics, and 808,549 in trades and industries. The program throughout the country in 1953 cost \$145,951,214. Of this amount, the Federal Government supplied only \$25,366,459 from funds made available under the George-Barden and Smith-Hughes Acts. With this foundation of Federal faith in the program our State governments added \$52,217,589 and localities put in \$68,367,164. This in itself shows pointedly that our States and localities are doing more than their share in sponsoring a program which has as its simple purpose to train young men and women for services that will in effect increase our own national potential in the event of emergencies. World War II showed us unquestionably that there was a need for skilled hands and the necessary know-how in agriculture, trades, and industries, and in distributive occupations. We as a Nation spent innumerable millions of dollars in training youths and adults to equip them to aid in speedup of defense production. It was at that time that we realized as never before the value of vocational training, the pattern of which had been set up under the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917. With the war over in 1946, Congress set about to assure that in years to come we would not face again this problem. The George-Barden Act had as its purpose the provision for setting aside an annual appropriation for vocational training to be administered by the States under a program of Federal standards. This program has worked well. Our States and localities have responded admirably. They continue to do an excellent job and the cost is being borne by and large by the States and local communities. The latest figures show that for each dollar of Federal money spent in financing vocational education the State and local governments spend \$4.75. This means that only 17.4 percent of the amount spent came from the Federal Government. It is obvious, therefore, that localities are assuming great responsibility for their programs.

This is not to say, however, that the need for Federal aid is diminishing. Local governments look to the National Government not for the amount of money they receive but because they have been asked by the Federal Government to assume a responsibility and they feel the importance of doing the job to the best of their ability. The very best job which vocational education can do has not yet been achieved but I believe that an even more excellent program can be administered and can be expanded if we here will demonstrate our continued confidence by raising the amount which we allocate for this purpose, all the time reminding ourselves that in so doing we are still expending in a program only about 80 percent of the amount of money which we originally intended to spend.

In offering this amendment I would also like to point out to the House that whereas the Federal Government in 1953 spent a total of \$25,958,383 for vocational education in this country—George-Barden and Smith-Hughes funds—we directed the expenditure of \$78,930,032 of Federal funds for foreign-aid education programs. While we were spending a comparatively small sum for the education of 3,039,347 Americans we were spending 3 times as much in the foreign-education program for only 15,410 persons. This speaks for itself. If the foreign-education programs are worthy and if they are doing a good job in training persons in other countries for a job to be done in years to come then we in this country have a right to expect by comparison a great deal more emphasis on vocational training than has yet been demonstrated.

My amendment would in some small respect be a demonstration of confidence in this program and an acknowledgment of the job that we have to do. We cannot be in the position of slowly reducing the amount of funds made available for such a worthy program when the cost per pupil to the Federal Government is only \$8.17 and the job which is being done is so valuable in our time.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I am inclined to think there is considerable sentiment for the adoption of the amendment that the gentleman is offering. I wish to call attention to a telegram which I received from the director of vocational education of the State of Illinois who says:

Illinois needs increased Federal funds for vocational education. Your support will be helpful to more than 650 of the 695 high-school districts in the State of Illinois.

Knowing the director as I do, I do not think he would make this statement at random unless there were a great deal of justification for it.

Mr. ABBITT. I thank the gentleman; I am sure he is correct.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Would the gentleman put in the RECORD the amount of the difference between what he proposes and

that which was originally proposed by the President?

Mr. ABBITT. I shall be glad to do that.

Mr. RIVERS. And the school districts affected; the loads which they have carried and their potential loads and the need for this for the fiscal year 1954-55?

Mr. ABBITT. I shall be glad to do that.

Mr. RIVERS. I have had a lot of conferences with my people and if half of what they tell me is true, this is one of the most vital of the aids that we give to education.

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by my good friend and colleague from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT]. I also wish to go on record in support of his amendment. I have had the opportunity to visit many schools in my district where vocational education is taught as a part of the curriculum.

I have had the opportunity to observe the beneficial effects of this program, and I feel that the House would be very wise in supporting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. ABBITT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JAVITS. I have a wire here from the superintendent of schools of the city of New York, Dr. William Jansen. We have over 1,300,000 school children in New York. The superintendent says:

Your support requested for amendment to House appropriation bill increasing the George-Barden vocational funds from \$18 million to \$23 million. This money is earnestly needed nationally for continuation of the present vocational program.

It is signed by William Jansen, superintendent of schools.

Mr. Chairman, I shall support the gentleman's amendment and would urge other members from cities to also support it in view of the distinguished support which this amendment has received.

Mr. ABBITT. I am very glad to find myself on the same side of a question with the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I should like to speak briefly in support of the amendment of my colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT] to increase the appropriation for this important part of this bill. I do this with the full realization that economy is important, and that is just what I have in mind. I fully realize that it most often appears that economy is served by showing a reduction in monetary allocations, and I do not quarrel with this generality. However, I do question the theory that you can save money or actually have worthwhile economy by not doing something that should be done for the general good. Mr. Chairman, I cannot review here all

of the values of vocational education, but I should like to emphasize that these two words, for a vast number of our youth and great numbers of our adults, mean the same thing. The training they receive in their vocation is their terminal education in many cases; it is the last step in the preparation for their gainful employment. We all profit from the gain they receive in obtaining adequate employment by this process.

For others this program allows a bootstrap by which they can acquire new knowledge useful in their occupation—better farming methods, better safety methods, better work processes and training for advancement within their field of labor.

What this adds up to is this: The general economy has a vital stake in the knowledge and training of its people. We have always believed in this country in education and in training, not only for the young but for those who wish to move up the ladder in their vocation or calling. I am satisfied that the economy will be repaid manyfold for this investment we make in vocational education and in the training it provides.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT] and would like to commend him for offering this much needed amendment. I support the amendment and urge its adoption by the House.

Mr. ABBITT. I thank the gentleman. (By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK), Mr. ABBITT's time was extended 5 minutes.)

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield.

Mr. BELCHER. I want to associate myself with my colleague on the Committee on Agriculture and say to him that I am wholeheartedly in support of his amendment. I think this program is one of the finest programs we have had in the State of Oklahoma. I certainly want to commend the gentleman for offering this amendment and say that I shall support it.

Mr. ABBITT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT] and wish to associate myself with his views.

Mr. ABBITT. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman for sponsoring this amendment. My friend comes from the great State of Virginia and is an able representative. I want to say that this is a most popular program all over the United States and I am very happy again to stand with my good friend from Virginia on this occasion in support of his amendment.

Mr. ABBITT. I thank the gentleman.
Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I want to express appreciation to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT] for bringing this amendment before the House. I hope the amendment will be overwhelmingly adopted, because this is a very important program, one in which I believe we receive more value for the funds expended than perhaps any other. The gentleman has stated adequately the very sound and valid arguments in support of his amendment, and I believe the committee will approve it by a very substantial majority.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT] and to associate myself with the effort to pass this amendment.

I represent a rural district where the program of vocational education means so much to us. This program gives us something practical. The courses in vocational agriculture, in home economics, in trade and industrial education are all of the utmost importance.

I had the privilege just a few days ago of urging the Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare of the House Committee on Appropriations to increase the appropriation for vocational education to a minimum of \$25 million. This amendment raises it to \$23 million and a little over. I think the amount should be larger, because the need is larger, but if we can add this \$5 million on to the program it will be a fine step in the right direction.

We must pass this amendment. We must add the \$5 million to the appropriation for the upcoming fiscal year 1955, which begins on July 1. I have a sense of urgency about the matter because even though the 7th Congressional District of Alabama has 48 teaching units of vocational agriculture, it needs 12 new units immediately. The district which I represent has 44 units of home economics education, and yet it needs immediately 17 additional units. We have 8 units of trade industrial education, and 1 unit of distributive education, but we need more of these units to fulfill our needs and bring the rich opportunities of this program to more boys and girls. Our colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] ably pointed out a few days ago that this is the program where we can save coppers and waste the pure precious gold of American youth and its ambition.

This increased appropriation will enable, I hope, at least some of the need in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama to be met. Likewise, it will enable the unmet needs in other congressional districts to be at least partially met.

The only regret I have about this matter is that we are not doubling the program of vocational education.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Chairman, I also want to say that I will support the

Fogarty amendment to be offered later to increase the appropriation for vocational rehabilitation from \$21 million to \$23 million, and another amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] to repeal the dangerous rider enacted on this appropriation bill last year and requiring that the individual States put up at least 75 cents for each dollar of Federal money that goes to a State under the vocational rehabilitation program. This rider was and is dangerous because it would mean that 980 fewer people would be served by the Alabama program alone. Two hundred and fifty fewer people would be rehabilitated in Alabama next year. I have this information from the Honorable O. F. Wise, able supervisor of vocational rehabilitation in Alabama.

Mr. Chairman, it is unwise not to adopt both Fogarty amendments.

I have had the privilege during this Congress of serving on a subcommittee on the problems of the physically and mentally handicapped of the House Committee on Education and Labor. We have taken days of testimony on this question. We have looked at facilities for the handicapped in New York, in Virginia, in Georgia, and in Alabama. Mr. Chairman, as a nation, we have barely scratched the surface in the field of human rehabilitation.

The United States is rehabilitating about 65,000 people each year, but there are about 250,000 capable of being rehabilitated. When rehabilitated these people go from the welfare and relief rolls to the rolls of the taxpayer. Actually, it can be scientifically proven that over the long run the rehabilitation of our citizens does not cost anything. The returns to the Treasury in taxes from their employment will repay Federal and State Governments every dime it costs to rehabilitate them. Why, then, should we hesitate? Why should we not go all out to do what is necessary to actually have a top flight program in rehabilitation? The passage of these amendments will be a good start.

Actually, Mr. Chairman, we are living in an age when there is no excuse for mass unemployment. Unemployment is spreading rapidly over the country. In Alabama alone there are 14 communities now on the critical or distress list from the standpoint of unemployment. Unemployment is a problem that this Congress must soon deal with. My home county of Walker County, Ala., has very disturbing unemployment. It is classed as a critical area. It needs help. The Federal Government should immediately go to the aid of such communities. There are needed public works and public improvements, river, flood control, and other projects that need building immediately. The vigorous prosecution of such a program now would relieve much human misery, and would at the same time prevent the spread of unemployment to other areas. Make no mistake about it the cancer of unemployment is spreading rapidly. Nearly 4 million people are unemployed. We must stop the spread of unemployment. We must aid areas of already serious unemployment.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Chairman, vocational education is an important and integral part of the educational system of Idaho. Many businesses, industries and farms depend heavily upon this program to prepare for them the workers they need. Hundreds of young men and women in the State count on it to give them training and skills with which to earn their own living. Still others draw from it the know-how which will make them better future farmers and better future homemakers.

To seriously curtail this program would be to deprive the State's industry and agriculture of a main source of new, trained manpower, and the State's young people of an established means of preparing them to earn their own living.

I therefore urge, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment to add \$5 million be adopted.

As an indication of the scope of the vocational education program in Idaho let us consider a few figures. Sixty high schools are teaching vocational agriculture. At least 40 of them have courses in vocational homemaking. Many others are requesting the introduction of such courses—or the expansion of those they already have. In addition, a number of high schools have courses in trade education, notably in auto mechanics.

Some of the colleges have more extensive training courses for the trades. At the Idaho State College in Pocatello, for example, there are 22 teachers in vocational education, with courses in auto mechanics, airplane mechanics, cosmetology, diesel engine mechanics, radio and television repair, electronics, secretarial training, sheet metal and body fender repair, and carpentry.

At Boise Junior College there are machine shops, sheet metal shops, body fender shops and furniture shops—to name only a few.

To cut down the vocational education program in Idaho—to jeopardize it in any way—would be a serious blow to my State. It is a strong right arm in our educational system. I therefore urge the adoption of this very important amendment.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT] increasing the appropriation provided in H. R. 9447 for vocational education from \$18,374,511 to \$23,673,261. This is the top increase which I advocated in my testimony before the subcommittee studying this subject.

I am one of those who feels that the Federal Government should not be called upon to provide assistance to the States when the States are able to provide such help for themselves. Whether in the field of education or otherwise, I believe that every State should do everything it can for its people before asking for, or expecting Federal aid. Even after our States have done that, in many in-

stances, I doubt the advisability of Federal aid for a number of reasons.

However, Federal assistance in this field is now a recognized necessity. I hope that some day our States will be able to carry this program on without Federal assistance, although I doubt that such will be the case for many years.

I have voted against many increases sought in amendments from the floor on appropriation bills. I believe we must rely to a great extent upon the recommendations of our committees. I have repeatedly voted to bring about economy in our governmental operations, but this is a field in which I believe we cannot afford to be pennywise and pound-foolish. We must not engage in false economy. We already know what vocational education has meant to thousands upon thousands of boys and girls who cannot afford a college education.

I was very much disturbed when I learned that this year the administration had again recommended a severe cut in the Federal appropriation for vocational education. While the cut of \$1,173,260 proposed was not as large as the proposed cut last year, it was nevertheless serious.

My personal observation of the vocational education program in my own State, after seeing these programs in action, and during my experience of three terms on the North Carolina State Senate, has convinced me that this program merits Federal support. I sincerely believe that the moneys which have been allocated to North Carolina from appropriations for vocational education have been wisely and economically spent. I know of no program, with Federal aid, which has made greater progress and which is doing more for the building of a better North Carolina and a better America than the vocational education program. These appropriations have enabled many boys and girls to learn to earn a livelihood and thereby boost our State and National income. College preparatory secondary education has proved to be insufficient to cope with pupils of all intellectual levels. Consequently, one of the most vital phases of our public educational program is that of vocational education, especially when more than 6 million pupils are enrolled in our Nation's public high schools. I understand that high-school enrollment has doubled and then redoubled during the years following the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act. Vocational education is rapidly becoming more and more important and its need is becoming more and more intensified because of our changing pattern of occupational employment. The States need encouragement in this field. I think all of us appreciate also the importance of vocational education to our national defense program. It looks as though we will always need a standby supply of skilled workers. Consequently, while the States are and should continue to assume the larger burden and cost of vocational education, it has a national aspect and a national impact which should not be overlooked.

The main point of contention last year, and I suspect again this year, is

whether or not this program should continue to receive Federal aid. Certainly, most of us are in agreement that vocational education is an effective and an important program which should be continued. If we believe in the program and if we believe it is deserving of Federal assistance, then we should not hesitate to provide adequate appropriations. If Congress is opposed to Federal assistance, then it should reverse its policy. However, I do not think a worthwhile program should be destroyed by indirection in the form of such severe appropriation cuts that its effectiveness will be destroyed.

I know it must have been a struggle for the early leaders in the States to get these programs started some 35 years ago. I also feel sure, had it not been for Federal grants which encouraged the States, the beginning would have long been delayed. All of those persons in the States who have had any part in the operation of this program, or who helped to provide the State and local support, are so accustomed to thinking of this program as a partnership affair between the States and the Federal Government that I fear the program would suffer if Federal support were now weakened in the least; particularly, when the facts tend to justify greater help. In fact, it appears to me that the need for further expansion of this program may be greater today than it ever has been at any time in our school history.

While vocational education was not specifically mentioned in the President's budget message, it was implied that Federal support for this program should be discontinued by 1955 or 1956. I now feel confident that this would be a serious mistake, unless there is an almost miraculous change in the present picture and the financial ability of the States.

In many respects, all of the subjects which are included in this great program are so involved by their contributions to the national economy and the general welfare of this Nation that they are entitled to Federal support. Agriculture, for example, in many respects is the basis of our national economy. Control of production of agricultural products is geared to protect the national welfare. In emergencies where more food and fiber is needed, all farm agencies respond to the national leadership when requests are made. At other times, when surpluses are excessive to the point that reasonable values are threatened, acreage controls are suggested and again the farm agencies respond. Vocational agriculture always participates in these emergencies. There is Federal support of all other farm agencies. I do not question that support. I am for it, but I do contend that since vocational agriculture is so actively engaged in an organized educational program which involves in-school farm boys, young adult farmers, and adult farmers that this program is equally eligible to receive Federal support.

The training for the skilled trades affects the skilled worker who either in peacetime or national emergency is indispensable to the national welfare. The productive capacity of our industries

was a decisive factor in our winning World War II. The training resulting directly and indirectly from programs made possible by the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts had much to do with making that production possible. We must not forget that many large industries are interstate in character and that skilled workers migrate. This program, which has many implications for national concern, must be kept strong. It needs much further development and the support which results from Federal aid.

There should not be any question raised about homemaking education. The future citizens of this Nation will be a reflection on the kind of homes we have today. The only organized training educational program designed specifically to train homemakers is the program of vocational home economics. Because of the direct influence on the national character of our citizenship, this program needs continued Federal support.

In discussing the distributive education program, I want to attempt to make two points. One is that lack of interest and Federal support by Congress affects adversely the State support, and the other point is that distributive education also deserves Federal support.

In support of my contention that lack of Federal interest and support weakens State support, I am told that a national survey revealed that in a great many States the legislature did not make up the loss caused by the Federal cut in distribution and the programs were curtailed. In North Carolina, during the 1953 year, the State operated its distributive education program with \$23,000 less money than it used during 1952. It was necessary to shift some of the customary State support to the local communities and to reduce the number of teachers employed. During the year—1954—there is available only \$15,000 more for this program than was available 4 years ago. The increase for this program during the 4-year period was only 15 percent while the average for the other three programs was 35 percent. There is no doubt but that the State was influenced by the national action.

Congress in good faith endorsed distributive education by authorizing an appropriation for it when the George-Barden Act was passed in 1946. When we stop to analyze the importance of effective distribution to our economy, it is difficult to understand why there is any question raised about the inclusion on an equal rank with the other vocational subjects the training for jobs in distributive occupations. Mass production, for example, so important to this Nation, is not possible without effective distribution. Selling, like all other types of jobs, has been affected by technology, and the salesman, to be effective, must be trained. The men who manage any business involving distribution, along with the public it serves, want well trained personnel.

Training increases the salesman's effectiveness; he and the business earn more and the public is better served. This type of situation duplicated all over

the Nation affects favorably our national economy.

Boys and girls who desire training for distributive occupations are just as deserving as are those who plan their careers for other vocations. Training for those should not be denied.

By the \$1,173,260 Federal cut proposed originally, North Carolina would have lost from its State allotment \$53,497. To many this may seem to be a small cut; but this \$53,497 affects the employment of 20 teachers. The North Carolina General Assembly has already made its appropriation for the 1954-55 budget and will not meet again before the 1954-55 fiscal year begins. There was very little provided for extension of services. In addition to the fact that no new teachers could be employed, regular salary increments for teachers would be jeopardized.

I believe that adequate Federal support of these programs is about the finest investment made in North Carolina in the field of education. I feel sure that such is also the case in most other States. Federal investment in this essential program has brought, and in my humble opinion, will continue to bring returns or dividends far in excess of the monetary amount of the investment. Because of my deep convictions about this program, I am therefore happy to support the increase provided by the proposed amendment of the gentleman from Virginia. It will make possible additional teachers which are so badly needed in North Carolina. I therefore urge this Committee to give its most serious consideration to this amendment. I hope it will pass. I believe it will pass.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I want to compliment my colleague on the Committee on Agriculture for bringing out this amendment and to associate myself with him. I hope the amendment prevails.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's remarks and his amendment will be very pleasing to the people of the Second Congressional District of Illinois who have written me and wired me urging my support for this amendment, which I give with the sense that my action is stoutly in the public interest. May I express my appreciation of the fine presentment of the subject made by the gentleman from Virginia. I understand that later an amendment will be offered to prevent disabling reduction of funds available for vocational rehabilitation. It likewise will have my support. I am confident that my vote for the present amendment and the one later to be offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] will meet with the wholehearted approval of the men and women of the district I have the honor to represent.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] very properly said this is a very important amendment. I thoroughly agree with him. In fact, it is so important it should be adopted.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I would like to identify myself with this very popular program. I am quite sure we are not going to have a record vote on it.

Mr. Chairman, it is with much satisfaction that I rise to support this amendment increasing the Federal appropriation for vocational training. Now that more and more youth of the country are given opportunity, even compelled to attend school for a longer time than formerly, it is all the more important that they be given opportunity to learn some of the arts of making a living.

Formerly it was the custom that every male child should learn a trade and the custom of apprenticeship was a universal custom. With the arrival of universal education that custom has been discontinued, but the basic reason for its existence in the past remains with us.

While the arts and customs of making a living have changed, the necessity remains. There can be no more important undertaking on the part of the Federal Government than that of sharing with the several States the responsibility and expense of contributing to the vocational training of the young people of the Nation.

I shall support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia to increase the participation of the Federal Government in that program.

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks made earlier in support of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I wonder if the gentleman from Virginia would enlighten me a little bit as to how all the Members of the House received telegrams urging them to support the gentleman's amendment in advance of his offering the amendment.

Mr. ABBITT. I would say to the gentleman that my knowledge as to the minds of others is limited. I would not be able to answer how these other gentlemen arrived at their decision.

Mr. BUSBEY. We do not always receive these telegrams just out of thin air in advance of someone's offering an amendment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Is it not a fact that our constituents throughout America have a right to send us wires and express their ideas on various amendments?

Mr. ABBITT. They certainly have.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. May I say to the Chairman that I do not think the wires were addressed to this particular amendment, but I have more than 100 telegrams asking for some kind of amendment to raise this amount even to as much as \$29 million?

Mr. BUSBEY. I have reference to the telegrams naming the specific amount in advance.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, as the Representative of the people of the Sixth Congressional District of Virginia, I take the floor, as I did last year, in defense of the vocational education program. Our people are sound, sensible, and conservative and they are outspoken in their demands for economy in Government and a balanced budget. At the same time, they are united in their individual and collective concern over our Nation's educational processes.

Last year the Congress restored the proposed cut in the vocational education budget, and I was pleased to have had a small part in assisting the cause.

It is difficult for me to understand why a further cut was proposed this year. According to a press release dated March 11, 1954, issued by the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, each State and Territory will receive under proposed legislation a net increase in Federal-aid-to-States appropriations ranging from 7 percent to 115 percent. In the field of education, there will be increases of 6.9 percent in the administrative expenses of the Office of Education, 21.6 percent in vocational rehabilitation, and 23 percent in the extension service under the Department of Agriculture. Yet it is proposed to decrease funds for vocational education. Why? The logic of this plan completely escapes me.

This cut cannot be excused on the ground that it is minor. True, it would cost the State of Virginia only \$34,487 during the next fiscal year, but the loss would not be monetary but cultural. The relatively small amount of money is not at issue; rather it is the principle which is at issue. Why should this particular phase of our overall educational program suffer while other phases are being expanded? At this point, I do not want to be misunderstood to be in opposition to these expansions. Indeed, I support every economically feasible aid to our educational program so long as direction and control is retained at the State and local levels. In speaking of the principle involved, many of us who

are champions of the vocational education program fear that the decrease in funds for that project on the one hand and a concomitant increase in funds for other educational projects on the other hand prophesies a trend of gradual demphasis which ultimately might lead to the complete emasculation of the vocational education program.

For fear of being called narrow-minded or isolationist, I hesitate to make the next point. But speaking my earnest convictions and in the discharge of my duty as I see it, I must say that I think it is high time we in the Congress began to think about our own American school children first and foreign students second. In fiscal year 1953, the Federal Government spent \$78,930,032 for education of 15,410 foreign students, while it spent only \$25,958,383 for vocational education of 3,039,347 American students. In other words, Uncle Sam spent one-third as much on 197 times as many American students as foreign students. Of course, all will agree that the foreign student exchange program has done much to disseminate knowledge, expand culture, create goodwill, strengthen the economy of our allies, and implement our national diplomatic policy, and there again I do not want to be misunderstood as trying to discredit this program. All I am seeking to do is to point up the folly of promoting the educational benefits to foreign students at the expense of American students.

Since the George-Barden Act was passed in 1946, we have never appropriated the maximum annual authorization of \$29,300,000. But for the permanent appropriation under the Smith-Hughes Act, annual appropriations in years past would not have provided the minimum funds necessary to do the job.

The vocational education program, operated as it is under State and local supervision and control, has never been the subject of a breath of scandal. The words graft, waste, and inefficiency have never attached themselves, even by innuendo, to the dedicated public servants who populate its administrative and teaching staffs. Instead this program and these people have earned for themselves the esteem, respect, and undying gratitude of their communities and the States and Nation they serve. Functioning as a partnership among the Federal Government, the State government and the local government, which jointly participate in the expense, this project is a shining example of the best in sovereign cooperation and governmental responsibility.

Not all of our young people can pursue a higher education. Not all of them can enter the fields of the arts, the sciences, and the professions. Personal preference, domestic conditions, financial restrictions, and individual aptitudes often require them to learn a vocation. For such students, training in agriculture, trades and industry, home economics, and distributive education fills a gap which otherwise might never be filled, and they would be thrust out upon their community unequipped to earn a livelihood and thus become pub-

lic burdens instead of self-sustaining, taxpaying citizens.

Gentlemen, we are dealing here with the future of our children, and when we deal with that, we deal with the destiny of our Nation. I urge the passage of the amendment to provide adequate funds for this all-important program.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. As I read these telegrams, it just means the people of this country are very much exercised about this matter and think we should back up the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. ABBITT. This is a matter on which we should go forward.

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. GRANT. I think this is a very excellent amendment. As to most of us, who have kept up with the program and know the fine work that has been accomplished, it is not necessary for us to receive telegrams telling up how to vote. We already know how.

Mr. ABBITT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I wish to associate myself with the gentleman's views, and I certainly hope his amendment passes.

Mr. ABBITT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia in support of his amendment for increased funds for vocational education.

The case is so strong for the program of vocational education and vocational rehabilitation that it should not be necessary to detail the arguments for these undertakings of our Government.

I am pleased to support the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia as well as the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] on the increase for vocational rehabilitation.

Mr. ABBITT. May I say to the gentleman that it has always been my thought that if it looks like we have the votes we ought to call the roll.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I wish to concur in the remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia. There is every reason why this amendment providing increased vocational education opportunities for young men and women should be adopted. A number of these reasons have been submitted by Kentucky's director of vocational education, Mr. James M. Patton. I wish to enter them in the RECORD here as an outline of the program to which these funds will be devoted:

JUSTIFICATION FOR CONTINUED FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

I. The number of departments or schools now being served by funds appropriated under the George-Barden Act:

1. Two hundred and thirty-four departments of vocational agriculture.
2. Two hundred and sixty-two departments of home economics.
3. Sixteen vocational schools.

II. The number of people who have educational opportunities because of the George-Barden funds is 43,996. Of this number, there are:

1. Eighteen thousand five hundred and seventy in vocational agriculture.
2. Nineteen thousand one hundred and one in home economics education.
3. Six thousand three hundred and twenty-five in the vocational schools.

III. According to a recent survey of needs for vocational education in Kentucky, the program should be expanded to include the following new departments or courses:

1. Nineteen departments of vocational agriculture.
2. One hundred and twenty-eight departments of home economics.
3. Thirty-one new vocational courses in the trade schools.

IV. Many of the programs now in operation in Kentucky should be expanded. These are as follows:

1. Sixty-four agriculture departments.
2. Ninety-six home economics departments.
3. All of the programs in the area trade schools.

V. If additional Federal funds could be provided for the expanded program as set forth in items III and IV, then:

1. Six thousand three hundred and forty-six additional people could be served in vocational agriculture;
2. Thirty-six thousand seven hundred and seventy more people could have opportunities for vocational home economics; and
3. Five thousand five hundred and seventy additional people would have trade-school opportunities.

This would mean total service to 48,686 additional people over and above the present vocational program.

If it was right for Federal funds in the beginning of the program in 1917, and everyone was led to believe that it was a wise expenditure of Federal funds, then it is still right, since we haven't met the full responsibility of reaching the people who are so desperately in need of the program.

VI. It has long since been established that vocational education is a national as well as a State and local responsibility. In a recent survey of one of the area trade schools of Kentucky, it was indicated that something like 60 percent of the graduates of the school found employment in other parts of the Nation other than Kentucky. Therefore, they were offering their technical knowledge for the advancement of the Nation and not just for the advancement of Kentucky.

VII. I am sure that an increase in the budget for vocational education will manifest the general attitude of the Congress,

for the Congress over the years and even in this present budget, has recognized the importance of the training of skilled technicians for foreign fields. They are to be commended for such a vision, for this program has meant much to the rehabilitation of the different nations of the world. In fact, this is one of the outstanding points on why that vocational education should be expanded in this country—because of the proven reputation of what our money has meant in the training of technicians for foreign lands.

If it has meant a higher standard of living for other people, as well as improvements in techniques that have led to increased production in industry and agriculture, then by the same token, it is a good investment for this Nation to continue an expanded financial program for the development of skilled people through an aggressive program of vocational education.

VIII. A state or a nation prospers to the degree that all of its people are trained. There is a direct relationship between the degree of skill and the earning capacity of workers. It is the aim of vocational education to work toward the providing of skills through its different training programs to the people of our State and Nation. This would, in the end, lead to a higher standard of living, a greater productive power, and a better tax structure for our State and Nation.

IX. Everyone recognizes the importance of military power when it comes to national security; however, it is rather difficult to argue for national security through military power and yet at the same time establish through practices and principle the philosophy of failing to provide sufficient funds that would lead to technical training of individuals who should operate this war machinery and provide the technical know-how to win a war and to maintain a peace.

X. The Federal acts for vocational education do, in a small degree, provide some equalization of educational opportunities throughout the Nation. In other words, we tax the wealth of the country where it is and send the money where educational services are needed and where there is insufficient wealth for such services. For example, in California, the average annual per capita income is \$2,032 and per capita receipts of Federal vocational funds is approximately 10 cents. In Kentucky the per capita income is \$1,135 and the per capita receipts of Federal vocational funds is 23 cents.

XI. Federal funds have encouraged local participation in the support of vocational education. For every dollar the Federal Government spends for the different vocational programs in Kentucky local communities are contributing \$2. Therefore, the intent of the Federal acts to promote and develop the program is working, and if the Congress could see fit to provide additional funds so as to further encourage the development, it is reasonable to believe, based upon past records, that local communities would continue to increase their support of the program. If this could be done, then the large backlog of Kentucky's youth who now fall to have vocational opportunities in their educational system would have such opportunities and would lead materially to improving not only the economy of the Nation, but would substantially add to the educational programs that are now so grossly neglected in many areas.

XII. Kentucky is considered one of the leading coal-producing States in the Nation, and the coal-mining areas are suffering largely because of an economic slump that is leading to the problem of unemployment. In fact, in the eastern Kentucky coalfields about 60 percent of the wage earners are unemployed. The Federal Government can approach this problem with two different philosophies. One, we can adopt the ideas of feeding the people and thus never lead

to substantially improving the economy of the area. This cannot be supported substantially as a long-range plan for the rehabilitation of the people in the coalfield. Second, the Federal Government can take a long-range view and provide through increased appropriation of vocational funds education opportunities to the youth of the unemployed areas.

The development of skills of the people would lead to the development of other types of industries that would in the end provide employment. It is a proven fact where there is a backlog of skilled labor that unemployment is held to a very minimum. It is strongly recommended that the Federal Government take the long-range view, taking steps to provide educational and employment opportunities to the people in the coalfields in Kentucky. If this isn't done, the problem will progressively get worse and will naturally lead to other complications of our society. Disease, crime, juvenile delinquency, and wrecked homes will be the end result of a short-sighted view of the problem involved. The people in these areas are a proud people and they are looking to the Federal and State educational leaders for guidance in solving the problem. To increase the funds for vocational education would be one of the many steps forward that should be taken toward developing ways and means of meeting the needs of the people in the coal mining areas. To shut our eyes to the problem is inviting disaster and that we cannot do. We very often get disturbed because of the destructive power of atomic energy. The most dangerous force, however, that is destroying many small communities in Kentucky is the economic and educational strangulation of the people. This is taking place quietly and does not present a sensational problem as the loud noise of an atomic explosion, but yet at the same time, forces are at work that are doing just as great a damage to the lives of the people. It is rather difficult for us, in places of leadership, to sense the problem because it is coming on us and having its effect in a gradual silent manner. In a disaster from a major explosion, flood, or fire, perhaps we would be rushing all the forces of government, both State and National, to the disaster area. This hasn't happened, but yet through unemployment for the wage earners in the coalfields, it is bringing about a major destruction through economic disaster.

XIII. The atomic age that we are in should convince all of us that there is a continuous desperate need for preparedness. This preparedness should go further than the Armed Forces. I am sure that the administration recognizes the importance of technical skills in agriculture, in home management, and in individuals who are to man the Nation's industries. Money spent on these programs is just as vital to the lifeline of the Nation as money expended on the Armed Forces. The next war, if there should be one, will not give us time to establish a war training program. Therefore, the only safe way is to adopt a philosophy of continuous training for a total defense of our Nation. It is hard to analyze how we can have continuous training with expanded facilities to meet present-day needs without providing sufficient revenue for conducting and expanding the different vocational programs throughout the country. I am sure that after the Congress has had a chance to reflect and determine the desperate need for continued development in different vocational areas of training that it will vote additional funds for continued expansion. In the face of such a need for vision, courage, and trained minds, we cannot afford to turn our faces backward and neglect the youth of the Nation and expect to remain strong. Therefore, I, together with hundreds of other leaders in the field of vocational education earnestly urge the Congress, in the light of the contribution that vocational education

has made to our economy and in view of the fact that there is desperate need of keeping our people in continuous preparedness, that Congress give serious consideration to voting additional funds for an expanded program in the field of vocational education.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak in behalf of adequate appropriations for the vocational education programs operated by the State boards of education under the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts. I can think of no example of Federal expenditures where we have gotten so much for so little, and I have no information whatsoever that indicates that the time has come to de-emphasize these programs. If anything, these programs should be strengthened.

I have had an opportunity to observe firsthand the results of the vocational agriculture program in my own district. A great many of our young farmers today are graduates from the vocational agriculture program. The scientific practices of crop and livestock management, insect control, soil conservation, and farm management which have done so much to raise the productivity of our farms had their beginning in the high school agriculture classroom.

We spend great quantities of money in this country at the Federal and local level to provide educational opportunities in colleges and universities to a relatively small number of our young people. In my opinion, we have done far too little in providing educational opportunities for those students who are not financially able or mentally equipped to enroll in higher education. The bulk of the vocational trades training in this country is directly dependent in part on funds provided under the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts. I certainly hope that we can continue a strong trades and industrial education program in our public schools and expand that program at every opportunity in order that the public schools can support the industrial and technical expansion of our country by providing trained technical personnel. The vocational education program supported jointly by the Federal and State Governments is an outstanding example of Federal-State cooperation. I certainly hope that the House will act here today to reaffirm its support of these fine programs.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that my good friend from North Dakota [Mr. KRUEGER] over the years has had a sincere interest in the vocational education program. He is to be commended for his interest.

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Chairman, first, I want to say a word for my friend, FRED BUSBEY, and the good work he has done on this Labor-Health, Education and Welfare bill. He has worked extensively—long hours, 12–14 hours a day on it, and I know he and his fellow committee members have done a fine job. With regard to one item, however, I wish he could have seen fit to spare us a little more money in the vocational education field. We all like to see something for the money we spend. So let us ask ourselves. Does the end result justify the means? What better investment can we make than in the future of our young farm boys and girls? Let us look to-

ward improving our own economy for a change. This business of tossing money away abroad I have said time and again, I am against it. To assist other countries in rehabilitating themselves, if they first want to help themselves is fine, especially if we have the money to spare. But if we have to penalize our own young to do it, then I say, look to our own first. None of us would take bread from the mouths of our own children to feed others. That is the long and short of just what we are doing if we do not see that this program has the funds to take care of those who are willing and able to take advantage of the training offered. This is very important to my own State of North Dakota. Many small communities would suffer economic and social setbacks in other States as well as my own if these funds are not increased, and the matching ratio restriction relating to vocational rehabilitation removed.

Many of the youth of our Nation—the farm boys and girls would not have these advantages to learn technical training and skills in these various fields—distributive education—retailing—trades and industries, if it were not for this program. Let us provide for our own. A nation is only as strong as its food producing and industrial capacity will permit. Let us make it strong in an educational way, and the other will follow. Let us equip these young people to apply new and improved methods in farming—new and improved methods in homemaking. Family life is the very basis on which our Christian living is founded. None of us can quarrel with the teaching of our young to be good, responsible homemakers.

I was glad to see this supplemental request come up from the President increasing the funds available for this program to the same amount as last year. But I would like to see us do better than that. I feel we can well make a wise and prudent investment in the future of our young farm boys and girls—in America's future—the future farmers and homemakers of America. Let us increase these funds and remove the restrictive matching ratio for Federal and State vocational rehabilitation funds which causes a hardship in many States. Let us bring it back to the basic law—remove restrictions that were never actually voted on by the House, as I understand it, but were put in in the Senate, and agreed to in conference in the House. It would be more in order if we waited to see what happens to the legislative proposals concerning this program now under consideration by the House.

I am a plain-spoken man. I like to talk facts. I believe in economy in government and reduction of unnecessary governmental expenditures and reducing the taxpayer's burden. I also have faith and belief in America and the Constitution on which it was founded. I believe in trying to promote its ideals, its growth and expansion, its improvement. What better way can we prove it than by putting money into a program that is something concrete—it is a human investment proposition. Proof of the pudding is what we get back in prosperous

farms, good homemakers, skilled laborers, and technicians.

The Smith-Hughes Act, the George-Barden Act, both have given the Federal Government the opportunity to further develop within the States the sound program of vocational education, a program that is administered and directed by the States themselves. This program, we might say, is a form of "earning a living" insurance. It is a cooperative program, with the States largely assuming the responsibility in establishing these courses and directing them, which is as it should be.

Mr. ABBITT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, my reason for offering this amendment is to give the youths all over the Nation a chance to have vocational training which is needed very much. I thank the Members for their kind attention. This is an expanding program and it is incumbent upon us to meet the needs of our youth. We must not let them down in these trying times. I trust the Members will support the amendment.

[Mr. CANNON addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

MORE FEDERAL AID TO VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it seems so foolish to come here and quibble about a few dollars on education. Speaking about the telegrams and letters that we have received, I have received more letters and telegrams on this subject than anything else since I have been in the Congress. My people in the Eighth Congressional District of the State of Louisiana are vitally interested in this kind of education; and being a poor district, with people of moderate means, can make good use of this assistance. From time to time, pleas are made on the floor of the House for the poor starving people of Europe. Last year, when we were about the adjourn, there were those who were crying crocodile tears because they wanted to give permission to the President to send butter to Europe for some poor, hungry children who they did not even know existed. The children I am talking about are not mythical children—these children exist in Louisiana. These children exist all over the United States of America and I say that it is not good judgment to offer such a small appropriation. I think we should make available the maximum authorization. There would be nothing wrong about that. In a few days, they will rush in here with a scare about something happening in Guatemala and we will vote a billion dollars for anything they request. Yet, we will not vote to educate the people who are going to have to fight our battles and who are going to be needed to carry on this Government in the years to come after you and I have passed on.

One of the high points in American history is the early and profound concern of the Founding Fathers with the problem of Federal aid to education. It is this fact, among others, which renders utterly incomprehensible to me, the lean support which some Members of

Congress presently propose to give to the purposes of the George-Barden Act of 1946, which authorizes annual appropriations for the further development of vocational education in the several States and Territories. The aims of the George-Barden Act evolved from the policy of the leaders in the founding of this Government. In 1785—even before the adoption of the Constitution of the United States—the Congress of Confederation adopted an ordinance providing for the endowment of schools in every township in the Western Territory. In 1787 the Congress had crystallized its policy declaring:

Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.

But when the Americans of 1787 said "forever, encouraged" they did not count with the prejudices of 1954 and the present budget experts who have infinite skill in being pennywise and pound foolish. When the Founding Fathers in preconstitutional days legislated for education they had a rural and agricultural and a pioneering population to deal with. Education was always important but it is infinitely more important today than it was then. Today, our economy is complicated, mechanized, complex, involved with technical and engineering problems undreamed of in 1787. It calls for precisely those skills and training which the George-Barden Act, adequately financed out of Federal funds, seeks to provide. Why do I mention this early American concept of Federal aid to education? I mention it to throw the facts of history into the teeth of those who associate legislation like the George-Barden Act with creeping socialism or with measures they hope to smear by characterizing them as products of new dealism, leftism and, for all I know, even communism. I will oppose, at the side of the most conservative Member of this House, any effort, every effort, to concentrate powers in the Federal Government that belong to the States, or to weaken the States by having the Federal Government perform the functions that properly belong to the States. And I will fight all the way from Dan to Beersheba and back again any legislation that smacks of the faintest taint of socialism.

But by the same token, I charge that it is bearing false witness to put the George-Barden Act in a category with the type of legislation that is inimical to rugged Americanism. As the Founding Fathers showed in dealing with perhaps the most ruggedly individualistic generation in the whole history of our country, Federal aid to education is the warp and woof of the American ideal. The generation they dealt with and the particular group of Americans they legislated education for were the pioneers about to inhabit the Western Territory, and the Americans trekking into the Northwest Territory. Let us therefore have done with befouling a good law with a bad name. Vocational education for all is as necessary to the preservation of our country, a democracy, as a system of defense for all; and it is an obligation of

the Federal Government to see that both are provided.

In this basic job of providing education, the States have a role to play and the Federal Government has a complementary function to perform by applying some of the financial sinews for the task of uplifting American youth. By uplifting, I mean helping them to create for themselves a better standard of living and, at the same time, training them in those skills which are indispensable to the national defense. For in war as in peace, our economy has a mechanical and an engineering foundation. The George-Barden Act is aimed at advancement of vocational education throughout the United States and its possessions. It authorizes moneys for administration, supervision, teacher training, vocational guidance and instruction, "and for establishing programs for apprentices, and the purchase or rent of equipment and supplies for vocational instruction." We have reached a point in our development as a Nation where we need both men and machines to preserve the peace or to fight a war. There must always be ready behind our machines, whether for war or for peace, a highly skilled and highly trained mechanical reserve to master the machines.

The State of Louisiana has 514 school-age children per 1,000 wage-earning adults. The average for the 48 States is 403. What this statistic means is that Louisiana has a heavier educational workload, so to put it, than the average of States in our Union. Many of our States have heavier educational loads than others. It means that unless the Federal Government steps in through the George-Barden Act, increasing the appropriation under the act, not decreasing it, there are thousands of children in our neediest areas who will be deprived of adequate vocational training. They will by that much be a burden to themselves, to their families, to their States and to the country.

I consider it a decision against the public interest and the welfare of our country to reduce the appropriation under this highly meritorious legislation. I want most emphatically, here and now, to register my support in favor of an appropriation on the sunny side of education in America and not on the side of the shadows dwarfing the competence and dignity of our young people by denying them the education and the training to make them better citizens.

Let us not quibble about this thing, let us vote unanimously for this amendment.

(Mr. ELLIOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak in support of the amendment to increase the appropriation for vocational education to \$23,673,261. If the amendment is adopted, it will mean an increase of only \$5 million over the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1954.

More than 5,000 high schools serving rural youth are without programs of vocational agricultural education, and

more than 7,000 high schools have no programs in home economics.

It is my opinion that the work being carried on in the field of agriculture and homemaking education is extremely important to rural people and the Nation in this highly technological age. This point takes on added significance when it is considered that our rural population is declining in proportion to the rest of the country.

At the present time only about 400,000 farm boys are enrolled in vocational agriculture. If every farmer-replacement is to have the advantages of vocational training in agriculture at the high school level, this number will have to be increased to 1 million.

Incidentally, I should like also to observe that with wholesale migration of youth away from farms into urban and city areas, it is equally important to provide adequate Federal financial support to other phases of vocational education. Rural youth who leave the farms will need vocational training to acquire skills which will enable them to become productive and useful citizens able to make a living in their new environment.

In defense of an adequate vocational educational program, I should like also to say that it is not enough to conduct research at one end unless there are people at the other end who can put the results of research into practical application at the farm level. The value of research must be imparted to the rank and file of farmers. Vocational agriculture education is one of the most effective methods of doing this job for the young people.

One has only to study the statistics on formal educational in the United States to realize that there are certain shortcomings in our educational programs. According to the United States Bureau of Census, persons 25 years old and older had—on the average—a little more than 9 years of formal education. As a matter of fact, the exact figure was 9.3 years. This represents an increase of less than 1 year over the 8.6 years of schooling for this same age group in 1940.

Differences among States ranged from an average of 12 years in Utah down to an average of 7.6 years schooling in Louisiana and South Carolina. Obviously, these figures point up very sharply that the great majority of the adult population does not attend college. This emphasizes the need for increasing funds for vocational education.

There appears to be a theory prevalent that local and State funds are adequate to provide for vocational education, or that the local and State governments can raise the necessary taxes to provide such funds. This is an erroneous assumption because local and State governments are faced with very serious problems today in increasing their tax base. The Federal Government's tax base represents a terrific load on our citizenry.

Thus, if the Federal Government does not provide some help, I am very much afraid that vocational education programs will suffer very much—even in the States that are vitally interested in this type of work.

In closing, I should like to place in the RECORD at this point, two telegrams

which I have received. One is from Mr. Voyta Wrabetz, chairman of the Wisconsin Industrial Commission. The second one is from Mr. C. D. Rejahl, executive secretary of the Wisconsin Association for Vocational and Adult Education. Here is Mr. Rejahl's telegram:

It is important to the Wisconsin program of vocational rehabilitation that the recommended budget figure of \$23 million be allowed this year, and that the present requirement that the States provide 75 cents for each \$1 of Federal money be repealed until satisfactory arrangements can be made in our State. We respectfully urge you to vote for repeal of the restrictive language and for the full appropriation of \$23 million in order that the physically handicapped of this country and State may be properly served.

Signed by C. D. Rejahl, executive secretary of the Wisconsin Association for Vocational and Adult Education.

I would also like to place in the RECORD a letter by Mr. Verne C. Fryklund, president of Stout Institute, a college specializing in home economics and manual training and located in Menomonie, Wisc. in the Ninth Congressional District. While President Fryklund's letter deals in part with the objectionable features of Senate bill 3271 which would eliminate Federal supports for various vocational education programs, it also gives an excellent analysis of the needs for Federal encouragement for education. Mr. Fryklund's letter reads as follows:

Congressman LESTER JOHNSON,
House Office Building:

As to fiscal 1955 operation of Wisconsin's unemployment compensation and employment service programs. If grants to States are again limited and restricted as just recommended by House Appropriations Committee, you are hereby on notice that tens of thousands of Wisconsin citizens will, when unemployed in fiscal 1955, again blame their own Congressman and both their Senators when they again experience inadequate service and benefit payment delays, like those resulting from slashed 1954 appropriations, which produced widespread protests this year.

House committee has recommended only \$200 million basic amount, to do the same work in 1955 which was poorly done at a higher cost in fiscal 1954. Further, costs will be higher in 1955, even to do that poor a job.

Committee unwisely cut basic amount \$10 million below request, but increased contingency amount by \$10 million, to be \$16 million. That shift makes a big operation difference.

Elsenhower 1955 budget called for \$210 million basic amount, plus \$6 million contingency.

Those Eisenhower amounts can and should be restored on House floor, by simply shifting \$10 million from contingency to basic, without changing total.

Urge you support that vital transfer.

VOYTA WRABETZ,
Chairman, Wisconsin Industrial
Commission.

THE STOUT INSTITUTE,
Menomonie, Wis., May 12, 1954.

Hon. LESTER JOHNSON,
Wisconsin District Representative,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: This letter refers to S. 3271, a bill sponsored by Senator SMITH of New Jersey to promote and assist in the improvement of vocational education and to make more effective use of available Federal funds in the United States and its Territories. This bill may reach the House soon.

This bill proposes to eliminate Federal support under the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden laws and amendments after a period of 6 years.

S. 3271 should not be passed for the following reasons:

1. It would eliminate Federal support to a form of education necessary for 40 percent of the male workers of the United States. It is education of less than college grade.

(a) Vocational education prepares workers in the know-how of processing raw materials into finished goods.

(b) It also includes education in agriculture, homemaking, and distributive occupations.

(c) It is a national problem and responsibility therefore.

2. Were it not for these Federal laws supporting vocational education, the United States would not now be in such a strong position as a leader in world affairs, and our make ready in time of war would have been slow, indeed.

(a) Much credit must be given Federal support to vocational education between War I and War II for the quick preparation made possible for War II.

3. Every nation must support technical education as well as academic education. Federal encouragement had to be provided in the United States because the educators early in this century would not accept it as worthy of a place because it was assumed to be devoid of instructional content. There are many who still think so.

(a) On the contrary, vocational education is full of instructional content and requires special understanding and skill on the part of its special administrators and teachers.

4. S. 3271 proposes to take administration out of the hands of the specialists and place it in the hands of the general administrators which could easily make a project out of it not unlike NYA, which was one of the doubtfully educational projects of NRA.

5. If Federal subsidies to the States are to be eliminated, it certainly is unwise to start with educational legislation affecting the man on the street who is the one who benefits most from the Federal vocational laws. We should start higher up.

6. People with vocational skills must be ready to, and do, move from State to State, therefore vocational education is a Federal responsibility. Several States that need vocational education could not possibly carry on a program without assistance.

7. It is said that vocational education is now established in the several States. It is not fully established in the minds of educators who have objected to the necessary Federal controls.

(a) The controls are necessary lest the funds be misused and diverted to other channels. Most administrators are not vocational educators and do not know the techniques of the program, nor do they see need for controls.

(b) History shows that because of lack of controls, Federal land grants to the States for educational purposes prior to the Smith-Hughes law were grossly abused by sale of lands so cheap that funds did not accrue to education. The vocational education acts were written to prevent similar abuse. It must be kept in mind that education desired and needed by most male workers, is protected by such controls.

Bill S. 3271 is an unwise proposal. It will hurt the United States if passed, and, of all time, when technical education must be encouraged rather than discouraged the Federal vocational subsidies should be preserved. To pass this bill will hurt too many people.

Sincerely yours,

VERNE C. FRYKLUND,
President.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, in 14 Southern States, we have a

larger percent of our population classified as rural than any other similar area in the United States. Also, there is a higher rate of farm tenancy in this area than that of any other area of our Nation. The income of the workers in the South is small in comparison to the other areas. Associated with farm tenancy and low income is a standard of living that is low in comparison to that enjoyed by other people of the Nation. Many of the problems of the Southern States can be solved through education to develop the ability of the masses of our people to perform the work of the Nation's occupations. The greatest assets of the South that enter into the production of wealth are human and natural resources. The full utilization and conservation of both in every area of this Nation are essential to our welfare and security. If we are to retain the position that the United States has in world affairs and have the ability to cope with the problems we are facing today, our lack of manpower in comparison to that of other nations of the world must be offset by the proficiency of our workers and by technological developments.

Vocational education as it has developed in this country since the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act in 1917, to provide for the promotion of vocational education, has made a notable contribution to the development of the abilities and skills of our working people. The accomplishments as a result of the stimulation of the Federal funds that this basic act appropriated were indeed notable. Therefore, the Congress of the United States felt justified in passing the George-Barden Act in 1946 to help meet the need for the further development of vocational education. This act authorized the Congress to appropriate funds in the amount of \$10 million for vocational education in agriculture; \$8 million for vocational education in home economics; \$8 million for vocational education in trades and industry; and \$2,500,000 for vocational education in distributive occupations. The act also authorized appropriations to provide minimum allotments to the States in the amount of \$40,000 for agriculture, home economics, and trades and industry, and \$15,000 for distributive education. While the Congress was authorized by the George-Barden Act to appropriate \$29,300,000 for the further development of vocational education, it has never appropriated in excess of \$19,842,000. In fact, there was a decrease in the amounts in 1952 and 1953 at a time when States were in need of additional funds for the further development of vocational education.

Vocational education has played a significant role in helping to change Alabama from one of our Nation's economic problems to one of the promising States. Throughout the years, all phases of the program have been staffed by competent and effective administrators and teachers. The local schools throughout the State have been stimulated and helped by Federal funds to provide vocational training to meet the needs of the individuals in the communities.

Three hundred and eight departments of vocational education in agriculture have been established in our State. Programs of instruction for high-school boys to prepare them for farming and for the adult farmers to improve themselves in farming bring to these groups the vast amount of scientific information that has been developed by our experiment stations and from other sources. The education and training these farmers receive develops their ability to produce and, at the same time, conserves our soils and other natural resources. The Future Farmers of America organization for our high-school students of vocational agriculture is helping to develop the leadership that is needed in our rural communities. There is a notable improvement in the standards of living of the farmers of Alabama who have had the advantage of this sound educational program in vocational agriculture. Our job has not been completed. As an example, the State officials report to me that they have applications for about 54 new departments of vocational agriculture and that 60 departments are in need of additional teachers.

The vocational home economics instruction that is provided in the secondary schools of our State is helping prepare girls for vocational homemaking, the vocation which the majority of girls enter. The program of vocational homemaking in Alabama is designed to improve family life. It is making an outstanding contribution to the improvement of family nutrition, housing, clothing, family relationship, and other recognized values of family living. We have in Alabama 297 departments of home economics scattered throughout the State. The schools where these departments are located employ our competent and well trained young women as home economics teachers. I am informed that the State has requests for 97 additional departments and that there are more than 100 departments that need additional teachers to provide instruction for the girls in the public secondary schools of our State who want to take courses in home economics. The communities where the departments are located also provide instruction for adult women.

Trade and industrial education is helping to provide skilled and technically trained workers needed for the new industries that are coming to Alabama and to meet the normal demand for workers for the old industries of our State. Not many years ago, there were relatively few workers in our State who possessed the skill or had the technical knowledge essential to industry. In the recent trend in Alabama from rural to urban centers, vocational education has played a major role in meeting the need for skilled workers. The trade and industrial and the distributive education program in Alabama embraces many areas of specialized training. The program not only serves the youth of our State but also adults who are preparing to enter and to make progress in a trade, industrial, or distributive occupation. This program of education has been estab-

lished and is being maintained in many communities in the State. However, the job has not been completed. Additional communities are requesting assistance in the establishment of the program of trade and industrial and distributive education.

There is a demand for the further development of vocational education in other States similar to that in Alabama. The interest in and responsibility for providing vocational education to develop the human resources of the Nation is broader than that of any one State or area of the Nation. This was recognized when Congress passed the George-Barden Act in 1946 and authorized appropriations to assist States in the further development of vocational education. There is no justification that the Federal Government does not have the resources to continue the stimulation and further development of vocational education by providing funds to assist the States in this all-important Federal-State cooperative program.

[Mr. MILLER of Kansas addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, having served on this particular subcommittee for 6 years, from 1943 to 1949, along with the late Honorable Frank Keefe, of Wisconsin, who is no longer with us, I have come to realize personally the great value not only of this particular program but also that having to do with vocational rehabilitation.

First, may I remind you that last month my Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture saw fit to give to Extension \$3½ million more than it has ever had, and the House saw fit to go even beyond that figure. Personally, I am pleased that it did. Here we have a companion measure to Extension, so to speak. Here we have an opportunity to help schoolchildren in high schools throughout America, help those who perhaps have no means of going on to college, to learn a trade before they leave high school and to make them better citizens. I cannot help but think that within a few weeks we will have before us a request for approximately \$3½ billion for foreign aid. In that \$3½ billion several hundred million dollars are for showing the people in other nations how to get things done, to give them our know-how, and to enable those people to learn trades and advance their status in life. Can we not afford to give one-twelfth of that amount to our own children in America for practically the same purpose? I think we can. I think we will be short-sighted unless we agree to this particular amendment. As the late Mr. Keefe from Wisconsin often said, if there are two justifiable sections in this particular appropriation bill, those two are vocational education and vocational rehabilitation.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that the House will see fit to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, vocational education has always had my support through the years. It is not a new subject to me. Many years ago, when I held membership on the Committee on Education this program was considered and adopted. I think it is a fine program. I think it is a good investment. I think it has done much good throughout the country, and I hope the program will be continued.

There is an amendment before the House to increase it something like \$5 million. A little while ago I received a telegram from the largest city in my district, Pontiac, Mich., and it reads:

Fight the appropriation cut in national vocational education and industrial arts program—

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. Let me finish the telegram, please.

Mr. TABER. There was no cut.

Mr. DONDERO. I will read the telegram:

Please fight the appropriation cut in national vocational education and industrial arts program. This Federal aid is necessary to help the working man.

Sincerely,

ALEX AITKEN,

146 Palmer Street, Pontiac 19, Mich.,
Director of Michigan Association
of School Employees.

Mr. Chairman, I rise particularly to ask the chairman of the committee if there has been a cut, as indicated by this telegram. I am inclined to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT], if there has been a cut, and to keep the program at least where it was.

Mr. BUSBEY. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that I am well aware of the interest and concern he has always had in the vocational-education program. I think the sender of the telegram has, unfortunately, been misinformed. As I understood the telegram, he is pleading with you to restore a cut that he thinks has been made in the appropriation for vocational education.

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct.

Mr. BUSBEY. I wish to state that there has not been any cut in the program.

The amount recommended by the committee to the House for consideration is exactly the same amount they had for this program for the fiscal year 1954.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I might say that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY], while technically correct, does not exactly state the situation that exists, that the dollar has taken a considerable drop in value since 1947 and 1948; we cannot purchase now in the way of services or aid for this \$18 million which is in this bill what could be purchased 6 years back. Consequently, to put this particular appropriation on the same level as it existed 6 years ago I think this \$5 million increase is perfectly justified.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee for a little clarification of the statement he just made. I believe the gentleman said it was exactly the amount of last year's appropriation.

Mr. BUSBEY. No; I did not say that.

Mr. BARDEN. I believe the gentleman said it was the same amount.

Mr. BUSBEY. I said the amount recommended by the committee this year was exactly the same amount as they had for this program in the fiscal year 1954.

Mr. BARDEN. The amount in this bill is not the amount that was appropriated for 1954, and the gentleman knows that there is a cut of \$298,750. What I tried to do was to get the gentleman to restore the amount and I thought we could get along or try to get along. But the gentleman was not content with that, so the department is given a cut \$298,750. That is the difference between the two appropriations.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. TABER. The \$298,750 cut came about because the amount requested was above the amount used last year; the budget estimate was above the amount that was used during this fiscal year by \$298,750. That amount was allocated by the department to other agencies in the department to take care of penalty mail costs. This will give them just the same amount of money they had in this current fiscal year without the cut of a single dollar.

Mr. BARDEN. But we get back to the point that the appropriation is not the same amount that it was last year.

Mr. TABER. That is true, but it is not a reduction in the amount available for the operation.

Mr. BARDEN. It is just a reduction in the amount of the appropriation by virtue of the fact that the Department used this to pay Department penalty-mail charges. Let me remind the gentleman, however, that penalty-mail charges do not furnish educational training to anybody.

Mr. TABER. But they do that very often when they have surplus funds.

Mr. BARDEN. And if this sort of thing keeps on from year to year it will dwindle until they will not have any appropriation.

Mr. DONDERO. This program of vocational education offering training to boys and girls so they may make a living, is a very constructive one and I am not in favor of reducing it.

(Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Last year it was my privilege to visit schools in my district and observe firsthand the operation of the vocational-education program. As you all know, my congressional district is a part of the breadbasket of our Nation as most of it pertains to agriculture. I saw there farm boys learning to repair and overhaul

farm tractors and other farm equipment which, in this day and age of mechanized farm operation, is highly essential knowledge. I saw other young men learning to be automobile mechanics; still others learning to be tinsmiths. I saw young girls learning the art of dress-making, others learning how to plan and prepare meals and become proficient in the management of a household. I saw young girls preparing for a career as receptionists in a doctor's office, and still others pursuing a business education. This program, as you know, covers agricultural education, business education, distributive education, guidance, home economics education, industrial arts education, and trade and industrial education.

After seeing this program in operation I am convinced that it carries an essential part of the well-rounded education necessary to prepare the youth of our Nation to cope with the problem of being self-sustaining. It is a program that should be expanded rather than curtailed.

Here are some facts that I would like to call to your attention:

The 2-year drought and drastic reduction in farm prices have reduced the income of the people in rural Missouri, and for this reason it is difficult for them to pay school taxes and almost impossible for schools to pass additional levies for local school support.

Because the Governor of Missouri vetoed a supplementary appropriation of \$9½ million for the schools, State funds to operate school programs are already critically short. If Federal funds are curtailed, this will make the general school situation even worse in Missouri.

The program of reorganization of school districts, leading to larger school service areas and hence better school facilities for all the children, is continuing in my State at a rapid rate. About the first demand which a reorganized district makes on the State department of education is for the allocation of State and Federal funds for vocational programs. In an effort to comply with these requests, reimbursements to local schools have been progressively reduced over the years, resulting in the reduction of teachers' salaries and the loss of vocational teachers. When these teachers leave the schools they generally obtain better salaries elsewhere, and the children are the losers. There were roughly 600 high schools in Missouri in 1952-53, 96 of these are in my congressional district. Their offerings and enrollments in vocational education were as follows:

	Teachers	Youth	Adults
Agricultural education.....	250	11, 142	9, 142
Distributive education.....	130	2, 544	1, 611
Home economics.....	312	17, 760	10, 836
Trade and industrial education.....	423	4, 762	6, 248
Total.....	1, 115	36, 208	27, 837

Thus, it is obvious that we have a long way to go before we provide vocational education in all the schools of Missouri for all the youth and adults who need it.

Each year finds a large number of youth in our public schools and one of their chief interests, and that of their parents, is in vocational education through which they can prepare to earn a living when they enter the world of work.

Many business and educational establishments are calling on the schools to expand their programs of adult education. In order to meet this need and those explained above, we shall need more George-Barden funds, not less.

During the postwar years vocational education has been neglected, in a way, in favor of expenditures for defense and foreign aid. That is, while the George-Barden Act of 1946 authorizes an expenditure of over \$29 million for vocational education, Congress has appropriated only about \$19 million, leaving the schools short by \$10 million. Ten million is really a small item in the total Federal budget. Vocational education is essential to the general welfare and the common defense. The additional investment in our own youth and our own productive know-how ought to be considered, I think, as we reduce appropriations for defense and foreign aid.

Therefore, I earnestly urge that this amendment be adopted.

(Mr. COLE of Missouri asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can get an agreement on a limitation of time. Everybody seems to have expressed themselves or to have extended their remarks. I would like to have 5 minutes in which to close the debate.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes. Everybody knows the problem.

Mr. RAYBURN. If everybody knows the problem why does not the gentleman forego his 5 minutes and have a vote now, asking that all Members have the right to extend their remarks in the Record?

Mr. BUSBEY. While everybody knows the problem they may have different ideas about it.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like 5 minutes.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I modify my request and ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes, the last 5 to be reserved to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MARSHALL. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, and I shall not, but merely as a matter of clarification, I have an amendment which I expect to offer to line 22. Under the chairman's request would I be precluded from offering the amendment?

Mr. BUSBEY. I would not think so. Mr. TABER. That is a different paragraph.

Mr. MARSHALL. It is the same paragraph.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, my unanimous-consent request pertains

only to the amendment that is under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply interested in vocational education. We must train our people to do productive work with intelligence and skill to meet the challenge of our expanding economy. Nothing is more important to our economy than to train our boys and girls to earn livings and to make homes. The vocational training program covers the teaching of agriculture, home economics, trade and industrial education and distributive education in our public schools. Many of these subjects are taught at night for the benefit of those who have to earn while they learn. I believe that in the long run the vocational education program returns to the economy by increased productivity a great deal more than its cost.

Since most of the cuts in appropriations for vocational education, within the last few years, have been in the field of distributive education, I would like to point out particularly the need for that program. Figures from the Bureau of Labor Statistics indicate that nonagricultural employment last month stood at about 48 million, and figures from the Bureau of the Census for the same time indicated that agricultural employment stood at 6.8 million. Wholesale and retail trade alone constituted 10.4 million of the 48 million nonagricultural total, or 22 percent. And yet, Federal funds appropriated for distributive education represent less than 3 percent of the total vocational funds appropriated.

Mr. Chairman, practically every Member of the House will agree as to the merits of vocational training but many will argue that the training should be given by the States and not by the Federal Government. With this I am in accord, but I am convinced that the interest of the Nation as a whole makes some degree of Federal support of this program vital and necessary. It is misleading to talk of returning vocational education to the States—that is where it has been all the time. The States spend about \$150 million a year on vocational education in this country, and the total Federal contribution to the program under both the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 and the George-Burton Act of 1926 is only \$25 million or one-sixth.

Furthermore, there is no element of Federal control; only the element of meeting minimum specifications for the proper use of these funds in the administration of the program.

The United States of America is the greatest Nation on the face of the earth today. The mass production which has resulted from our industrial development and our know-how has been largely responsible for our winning two major world wars. All of our skill is now being

called upon either to prepare to wage, or I would hope to prevent, another war.

We have great natural resources in this country, but our greatest resource in the long run is the youth of our land. We have no monopoly on youth. In fact, nations with tremendous quantities of manpower have a greater potential in numbers than we do. Therefore, if we are to continue to maintain our position of leadership in the world, for peace or for war, we have to excel in brainpower and in skill and that means in education.

If our State borders were like the boundaries between sovereign nations, with heavy immigration restrictions and regulations, there would be some reason for each State to completely and independently support its own vocational education program. However, migration of workers over the United States is free and untrammelled at all times. The migration of factories and industries, which I have referred to earlier, is likewise untrammelled. The workers seek the industries, or the industries seek the workers, across the State lines. Therefore, why should we, in Virginia, support completely and totally a program for training workers who, upon receiving the best we have to offer, will promptly leave to add to the productive capacity and industrial power of another State? Why should they train workers for us?

Virginia benefits in a large measure from her training of her own young people, of course, because we are now making new opportunities for them to be employed at home. For several generations until now, according to the late great historian, Dr. Douglas Southall Freeman, one of the principal Virginia exports was brains. Many of our best young people went north to industrial centers, where opportunities existed for them. We have better opportunities in Virginia today. However, the fact that young people trained in other States can come to Virginia to work, and the ones we train can go elsewhere, in itself, indicates that the Federal Government has a part to play in this training program.

Moreover, it must be remembered that the citizens of Virginia who receive this training are also citizens of the United States, and improved technique makes them more useful to the Nation in times of peace and war. This expenditure can, therefore, be justified as a national-defense item.

As all of you know, I have been a vigorous advocate of the point 4 program for technical assistance overseas. I believe that one of the best ways to stop the spread of communism abroad is to improve the standards of living in non-Communist countries. That is best done by increasing their technical know-how, thereby adding to their self-sufficiency and self-respect, rather than by a dole. This technical assistance program overseas is nothing more than a vocational education program, as we know it here. I think it is a wonderful thing that America has progressed to the point of international understanding where we have such a program. But certainly if we have realized the justification for providing that instruction for other nations, we cannot neglect our own youth

and fail to provide the proper vocational training for them, also. If it is proper for the Federal Government to give such instruction to the people of other free nations, certainly there can be no question about the propriety of giving it to our own sons and daughters.

All of you know, also, that I have been one of the foremost proponents on the floor of this House of economy and a balanced budget. But let me add that if you decrease the productive power and earning capacity of American citizens by reducing or eliminating this vocational-education program, eventually your budget will be put worse out of balance than before. Low-paid and unskilled laborers do not pay many taxes. Skilled workers add to the productivity of America, they pay taxes on the incomes they earn, and the country benefits manifold in dollars and cents from this program.

Mr. Chairman, it is false economy to reduce the earning capacity of our people of denying them the advantages of modern education. It is sound economy to increase their skills and earning capacity by giving them the advantages of vocational education. We cannot ignore the fact that the Federal Government shares with the States a portion of responsibility for vocational education in a land of free industrial migration. Let us meet that responsibility today by appropriating adequate funds to provide a vocational-education program commensurate with our modern needs.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I think very few people realize that practical nursing should be included in this program.

Mr. GARY. I appreciate the comment of the gentlewoman from Ohio.

(Mr. GARY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McVEY].

(Mr. McVEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Chairman, in the beginning I should like to commend the chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSHEY], and his coworkers, for the very fine work they have done in producing this bill. It is very rare that I come to the well of this House for the purpose of asking for additional money, but vocational education is very near and very dear to my heart because for many years I was on the receiving end of what the Federal Government appropriated for this purpose.

In the case of our metal workers, our auto mechanics, our electrical workers, and many other teachers engaged in vocational education, it would have been impossible for us to have carried on this work successfully without the help which we received from the State and the Federal Government. The Federal Government and the States, in the matching

process, pay one-half of the salaries of the men and women who engage in this very important work for the high schools. Those salaries have almost doubled, with the rise in the cost of living, and if we continue to decrease the level of appropriations for vocational education, it is going to be very hard to pay the salaries of those teachers who have been laboring for so many years in these departments and who are deserving of an increase in salary which perhaps can be made possible only through the money which is received through the funds devoted to vocational education.

Therefore, I lend my support to this amendment, as much as I dislike to go contrary to the wishes of my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSHEY] and his committee. I feel that there is a need for an increase in the amount devoted to vocational education.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

(Mr. LANHAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, the State of Georgia and its citizens have, throughout the years, taken the leadership in the promotion of vocational education. The one-time director of this work for the State of Georgia was Mr. M. D. Mobley, sent to Germany after the end of World War II to help in the reestablishment of the educational system of Germany. Mr. Mobley is now executive secretary of the National Association of Vocational Schools and is doing a wonderful job here in that position, just as he did in Georgia, and as he has done wherever he has served in the promotion of vocational education. In the Senate and the House, Representatives from Georgia, beginning with the days of Senator Hoke Smith, who has been dead these many years, and on down to Senator George, who is the coauthor of the George-Barden bill, the law that is now on our statute books, have been leaders in this field, and I am glad to lend my support and to follow in the steps of the Georgians who have so long fostered this program.

Vocational education is being very effectively administered in Georgia now by Mr. George I. Martin, under the overall supervision of Mr. M. D. Collins, Georgia's long-time commissioner of education.

While I am speaking on the subject of vocational education, I want to refer to the field of distributive education, in which I have been especially interested. I understand that amendments will be offered to remove from the bill now being considered, restrictive provisions which will hamper the administration of distributive education. I shall vote for the amendment or amendments that will accomplish this purpose.

I have championed distributive education especially because of the fact that in my home city of Rome, Ga., the program has meant so much to young people struggling to prepare themselves to support themselves and their families. I know of one case especially where a young woman, the daughter of workers

in one of the textile mills in Rome was able to prepare herself for effective work in the distributive field. The results to her have been of so much benefit and she is so grateful for the help she received from this type of education that she was willing to come to Washington to testify on behalf of distributive education before the subcommittee which brought this bill to the House.

At this point I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY], the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, and his colleagues, for the graciousness and interest with which they heard this young woman testify. I refer to Mrs. Nellie Towns Milton, who, because of her training in this field, has now risen to the point where she is office manager of a large specialty store in Rome. In her testimony, Mrs. Milton said, and I read her words into the RECORD:

I am a graduate of the Rome High School, class of 1948. It is certainly an honor and a privilege to appear before this committee. I feel that I have gained so much from distributive education that I can speak in behalf of all those currently enrolled in this program of training.

I feel this program has done a great deal for me—more than anything else I could have received during my school years.

Forgive me if I speak personally, but I feel that through my own experience I am justified in making this type of presentation.

In 1947 I enrolled in the junior year of distributive education training in addition to my regular high-school course. I was placed on a job training in the sales department of one of our large national organizations and I worked 28 hours a week for the 9-month school term. At that time I was 17 years old. Because of this financial assistance it made it much easier for me to gain my education and also helped my parents. At the end of my junior school term I was transferred, at my request, into a locally owned and operated retail organization in my city. This was a more specialized sales training requiring more specific merchandise knowledge, closer public contact, and a higher degree of skill on my part. When I graduated from high school—and I don't mean to boast—I graduated as 1 of the 3 top honor students in a class of about 200. I bring this particular point out because I feel that my ambitions were heightened as I realized just what all my subjects in school were doing to help me in my job and in later life.

Upon graduation, my employer immediately offered me full-time employment and a very substantial increase in salary. From the sales floor, I was advanced into controls, and today I am office manager of Wyatt's, Inc., in Rome, Ga. This is a specialty store and has a personnel of about 40.

I feel that my training and the resultant self-assurance that I acquired at the age of 17 during my school years have enabled me to attain the position that I now hold.

I am a native of Rome and my parents are also. Both my father and mother were employees in the textile industry.

I speak for the thousands of young people who are receiving this training today. From my own observation in my job I can see that definite training has to be given to people who are entering the field of distribution.

Since our economy is based on the balance between production and consumption, it is not actually a matter of production, but what part of that production gets to the

consumer that counts, and that is the field of distribution, as you well know. Since our production has overrun distribution and products are not getting to the consumer lately, distribution is more important than ever.

I cannot really find ways to tell you how much I value this distributive education program. Perhaps if you might have some specific questions to ask, I could answer them and I would be happy to do so.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. When the George-Barden Act was passed, there was authorized an appropriation of \$29.3 million annually. But, we never appropriated that much money because we did not have enough teachers. We have the teachers now. I interpreted the telegram of the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] to mean that what the sender of that telegram meant was that no cut below \$29.3 million should be made.

Mr. LANHAM. I thank the gentleman, my distinguished colleague from Georgia, for his contribution.

(Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I feel that a word of commendation is in order for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY], the chairman of this subcommittee, and his colleagues who worked with him on the subcommittee, for the excellent bill which they have brought in making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare. In the main I believe that the bill deserves the support of all the Members, and up to this point I have been voting to support the committee.

However, we have reached a point now where I cannot go along with the committee. I favor the Abbitt amendment, and shall vote for it. This amendment adds approximately five and one-third million dollars to the amount appropriated for promotion and further development of vocational education.

I agree with the statements made here today by many of our colleagues that money appropriated for vocational education probably gives more returns for the dollar spent than any other educational program. This program teaches the boy and girl the very necessary and essential lesson of how to earn a livelihood. It equips him and her to stand alone and be independent. There are many boys and girls who for one reason or another will not take a course at a college or university. Their education will end at high school. So far as these children are concerned, the vocational training which they receive will in many, many instances be the most valuable part of their entire education.

The amount which is authorized for this purpose under the law is \$29 million, and if the appropriation this year is increased to \$23 million plus, in accordance with the Abbitt amendment, it still will be more than \$5 million under the amount authorized by law.

This program trains students in agriculture, home economics, trade and industry, and distributive occupations. The Smith-Hughes law also provides for teacher training.

We have lavishly scattered not millions of dollars, but tens of billions of dollars all over the face of the earth, spending American taxpayers' money for almost every conceivable purpose for the benefit of people in just about every nook and corner of the world. Taxpayers' money has been spent for education in many foreign countries. Our duty to our own children should prevent us from cutting this item too low, and I do not mention the money which has been spent for foreign aid and foreign giveaway programs as any justification for unwarranted spending in this particular. I have voted against much of that foreign spending program, and expect to continue to vote against much of it. I mention that merely for the purpose of saying that our obligation to American children is far stronger than our obligation to children and people of other lands. I do not think an appropriation of the amount called for by the Abbitt amendment is extravagant or wasteful, and I wholeheartedly support this amendment.

While discussing this appropriation bill, I want to state also that I am heartily in favor of the amendment which the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], expects to offer later this afternoon to strike from page 17 of this bill the language which requires the matching formula by the States of 75 cents to \$1 of Federal money. I also expect to vote for his proposed amendment to increase the amount for vocational rehabilitation by \$2 million, to bring that sum up to \$23 million.

This vocational rehabilitation program likewise is one of great importance to our people, to the States, and to the Federal Government. It is a program which gives great returns for the amount spent. Unless these amendments are adopted, there will be approximately 5,000 people needing vocational rehabilitation in the coming year, who will not get it. I urge the adoption of the Fogarty amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

(Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi and Mr. BAILEY asked and were given permission to yield the time allotted them to Mr. BARDEN.)

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, this is not a new subject to me. As the House well knows, I have been intensely interested in the vocational-training program for many years and have had the opportunity to observe the benefits derived from that program.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] has not only been intensely interested in this, but it is under the law which bears his name in part that this particular program is being operated today.

Mr. BARDEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman has been one of the greatest benefactors to the cause of public education.

(Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to transfer the time allotted to him to Mr. BARDEN.)

Mr. BARDEN. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks. They have been well worth the trip to the well.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I want to say that the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina has done more for the education program, at least as much as, if not more than, any man in this Nation.

Mr. BARDEN. I am grateful to the gentleman.

As I said a moment ago, this is not a new program to me. Last year and the year before, for some unknown reason, there were efforts to cut the appropriations for this program. And this year is not unlike the other years. I wanted to increase the amount allotted to the program to the point where it could wisely use the money especially in view of the fact the program was doing such a grand job and doing it without waste. I discussed the matter with some of the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle. My request was, "Do not cut these funds. We want the same appropriation as was provided last year at least."

I am frank to say, as anxious as I am for an adequate appropriation, there would have been some reluctance in my going ahead, had the request been granted. Now they come in here with this appropriation reduced \$298,750 from the last appropriation. And they claim that action is justified on the basis that some few States did not use all of the funds available. When a cut is applied to the appropriation to be distributed to all the rest of the States for the coming year, the cut will be general and will be applied to every State in the Union. I think that is perfectly obvious. I think that is a perfectly fair statement.

As long as I am permitted to be a Member of this body I shall never permit funds to be reduced in a program that is rendering the service to the American people that this program is rendering.

Where are we? Here we are talking about reducing the program for vocational training. We have spent hundreds of millions of dollars all over the world under the point 4 program. Some say that that is wise. But let us lower our sights a little bit and see what is going on here at home. The average boy here volunteers or is taken under the selective-service program. In age they range from 17 to 19 or 20 years. What happens to them? They are put in camps. There is hardly a camp in this country—and everybody in this House knows it—that does not have

some kind of vocational training school. And that program in that camp costs \$10 to \$1, compared with the cost of this program. They cannot make a dollar go one-tenth as far as a dollar goes under this program.

I fought for a resolution—and the House adopted it—calling upon the various agencies of the Government to account for these funds, to take an inventory and see how the money is being spent. That resolution is still resting over in the other body.

Is it going to do any good to disintegrate this program, to take funds gradually away from those who are equipped, from those who are handling it advantageously at the moment, and then scatter it and attempt to whittle down the program in that way? It will not work. You only have to call on these schools, visit one of these vocational schools on these camp sites, and you will find the finest kind of machinery, the finest kind of tools, and the finest kind of teachers; and the teachers are not handicapped. But we are not so generous in the normal vocational training school.

I do not plead this cause only for North Carolina because North Carolina, recognizing the good, sound commonsense of the program, already appropriates more than \$1 million more than it gets in the matching funds. The matching funds amount to approximately \$1 million, and North Carolina last year appropriated \$2 million, \$1 million more.

Let me say to the ladies and gentlemen of this House. Do you realize that those vocational teachers in the highest levels, the skilled, trained ones, are drawing only about \$4,000 a year. We pay janitors that much.

Yet we are asked now to whittle a mere \$298,750, which will be cut from all States in the redistribution. It just is not right, and I do not believe this House is going to tolerate it. If we are going to take notice of any one successful, justified, and worthy program where a dollar of Government money is spent with more good results than any dollar I know of, if we are going to begin to whittle on that one, then I am sorry to say I am out of step.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. As a matter of record, in spite of the fact that Federal appropriations have been held down over the years, I have some figures in my hand that show that the States have been demanding funds for about 15,652 more teachers for this important program throughout the United States. It seems to me we should pay some attention to the demands of the people in these States.

Mr. BARDEN. As I have said on many occasions, I do not believe a person is educated until he knows how to earn a living. These boys are able to contribute much to the welfare of this Nation or to its defense when they are trained in some skilled trade and know how to step out on their own. With the armed services—through selective serv-

ice and otherwise taking the youth of this land from the high schools even before they can graduate in some cases—it behooves us to step up the vocational program instead of slowing it down. If they get vocational training before entering the Armed Forces then the Armed Forces will be better off and so will the taxpayers of this country. I am in favor of the amendment to increase the appropriation \$5 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER].

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, under the time limitation imposed I do not have time to make my annual vocational education speech. However, I would like to associate myself as being in accord with the position just taken by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FORRESTER. I want to go on record as adopting the statement of my colleague from Georgia, along with the statements of my other colleagues from that State.

May I say that it is my observation that this is one type of education that people can use for the balance of their lives. The time is coming when it is really going to be mighty necessary that people know how to work for a living.

Mr. WHEELER. In very rapid conclusion, let me make one suggestion to those who might be inclined to oppose this amendment, and that is this: If you are going to oppose adding \$5 million to an appropriation for the vocational training of American boys and girls, then in all consistency you should be here when they bring up the next appropriation which provides for financing the sending of vocational education people from this country to Germany to teach the Germans something about vocational education, especially in view of the fact that originally we imported from Germany our basic knowledge concerning this particular subject. I cannot understand how you can spend \$350 million educating boys and girls in every foreign land on the face of the earth and then quibble over adding \$5 million to the financing of a program in this country.

(Mr. WHEELER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

(Mr. WHITTEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, it is my belief that there is little need to say much here so far as getting this amendment adopted. I believe it is going to be adopted. I do not know that there is much I need to say—I hope not—to show I have been actively interested in this program throughout the years. Last year I prepared the amendment which restored funds to this program. I would like to point out at this time 2 or 3 rea-

sons why I believe that in adopting this amendment we will be taking action which is best for our Nation. In recent years, I have had the privilege and the job of being in close and direct contact with the operations of the Department of Agriculture and with agriculture generally. We are beginning to see that agriculture, which is what will largely be handled under this program in my area, has become a highly specialized undertaking. There are new developments with respect to hybrid seeds; with regard to diseases of plants and animals and on insect control. Today farming requires complicated machinery. The investment in a crop today is tremendous and certain and specific knowledge is essential. Certainly at this time, it becomes more and more necessary that specialized training be given to those who expect to follow the pursuits of agriculture in my area. The same thing applies to practically every other section of our country which comes under the vocational education program. Certainly here where these moneys are going into our schools where the number of students is constantly increasing and where the job of training these young people to meet the needs of their profession in the future becomes greater each year, it is certainly wise to give proper attention to it. The only reason this additional sum is not included according to the committee is because the Bureau of the Budget has not included it; yet that same Budget Bureau has approved many times this amount for similar work in foreign lands. It has been my experience that the Bureau of the Budget and its decisions certainly should not be conclusive upon what we do here because frequently they go along from year to year just saying, "This is what they had last year and this is what we will give them now." What they have done this year is to make them absorb all the mailing costs and, therefore, they have actually reduced the funds available as compared to last year.

I need not point out the value of the FFA to the youth of our country. We do not need to fear communism there.

May I take a moment here to say that here we provide training for young active people. We need also to give attention to vocational rehabilitation where we give attention to training those with physical disabilities.

Mr. Chairman, our Nation wastes lots of money, but money spent on training our people is money well spent, which will return benefits far beyond the costs.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

(Mr. MARSHALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, this item is very important to the welfare of all the people of the United States. We are talking in terms of giving people the know-how of a way to make a living, which is so necessary for our people. So far as we are concerned in this program, there are a number of features in it. It is no wonder that we have had so many inquiries from people through-

out the country as to the need for this program. What does it affect? It affects training in four vocational fields. One is agriculture, another is home economics, another is trades and industry, and the other is distributive education. That covers just about everything a person does in this country outside of the professional groups so far as making a living is concerned, does it not? And we know how necessary it is in this complicated way of life that we have that we should give our people the best training possible to make a living. We live in a competitive world. Why is the United States of America the great Nation that it is? It is because in this competitive world of ours, we have been able to have the know-how and the ability to do things. It is important that we continue to have the know-how to do these things. This is economy in every sense of the word. It is an actual economy to pass an appropriation which provides for proper training for our future citizens who will make a living and thus keep this United States of ours strong. I urge the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT] be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I assure the Members of this body that I do not take second place to anyone in my esteem and my respect and affection for the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN]. We are all familiar with the wonderful work he has done, and I know we all subscribe to it 100 percent.

I also want to subscribe to all of the fine things said by everyone for this program, but I think, in view of the apparent blitz on the Abbitt amendment, you are entitled to an explanation from the committee on this item. First, if you will turn to the hearings on page 412, you will see where the States, since 1918, have increased their participation from \$2.65 to \$4.66 for each dollar spent by the Federal Government. That is as it should be. I think all of the States are to be congratulated for it, and particularly the State of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], because I think North Carolina has really been one of the leaders in this program.

Referring back to the committee print, I note that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT] will increase the appropriation to an amount \$3,695,501 greater than any appropriation made for this program since its inception.

Taking these factors into consideration and taking into consideration the fact that we hear speeches day after day on the floor of this House decrying centralization of Government and stating that things should be put back into the States, and the States should assume more responsibility, it did not seem to the committee that we should recommend any more for this program than the full amount that was available for 1954. Furthermore, if the entire \$7 billion in Federal tax reduction goes through, that will leave \$7 billion more for the States

and local communities with which to support and increase their participation in the vocational education program; at least to the amount of \$5,298,750, if that is the amount by which the total program needs to be increased.

There was no desire on the part of the committee to criticize or to do any harm to this program in any way whatever.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. Not at this time. I have another point to make with reference to the statement of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER]. The gentleman talked about the money appropriated for programs all over the world. I would like to inform the gentleman that, irrespective of how the majority of the Members voted, if they had all voted like I did, we would not be spending this money on these foreign programs, because I have never supported them, and I will not support them this year. I would rather have more money spent on our own children right here in this country and not have to fight for a few hundred thousand or a few million dollars on an appropriation bill that provides for our own people, when we are spending billions of dollars all over the world.

I now yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I am in agreement with what the gentleman says about economizing, but I understand the gentleman supported an increase of \$6,300,000 for Howard University. How does he reconcile an increase of over \$6 million for Howard University and then cutting vocational education all over the United States?

Mr. BUSBEY. I will say that, when we brought in this bill, we thought everybody would be happy, because it provides the same amount for vocational education that was available last year. Evidently the committee was too optimistic.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Of course, there was no politics in the Howard University matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

(Mr. SCHENCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, the appropriation bill being considered here in the House today is of special concern to our Nation because it affects the education and training of our children.

It is a well-established principle of education that we learn by doing. Teaching students the proper information and skills related to vocations is not only very desirable from educational and cultural points of view but they are also very important from an economic point of view. School population is increasing in almost every section and area of our Nation because of the great increase in birth rate in recent years and as these students are graduated in the coming years they will not only need an opportunity to work but also must have the skills and abilities to do the work. The matter of marketing the products of our Nation also requires training in distributive education. Also, Mr. Chairman, the several kinds and types of

vocational education require greater sums of money because special space arrangements and equipment are required to care for those who are enrolled in the program.

Therefore for these several reasons and other reasons which will occur to each of us, it is right, proper, and necessary that adequate funds be appropriated for the well-rounded education of our children. Many school districts, because of the very great increase in their school population, are already being taxed to the full extent of their statutory limitations.

It is, therefore, my firm conviction that proper funds should be appropriated for vocational education.

(Mr. TOLLEFSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT] which seeks to add approximately \$5 million to the funds for vocational education. The value of this program has been recognized by the House in previous years. Its value is also well known to the general public. I can think of no program which renders more service per dollar spent than this one. Under it our citizens are given an opportunity to receive vocational training which otherwise they could not get. In my own State, and particularly in my own home city of Tacoma, I have seen at first hand the excellent results of vocational education. Young men and women are afforded a chance to learn some trade or vocation which will enable them to better earn their livelihoods. The long-range benefits to our general economy which result from this program far exceed the costs thereof. The amount of money involved is not great, and I trust the amendment is adopted.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I share the reluctance of the House to increase the figures recommended by the Appropriations Subcommittee, but I am convinced that some changes are justified in the items for vocational education and vocational rehabilitation. I have had occasion to observe the program in the State of Arkansas and am convinced that valuable results are being achieved. In many instances trained workers are finding use for their skills in other States, particularly in defense industries, hence this program is impressed with a national interest. We should work toward the goal outlined in basic legislation sponsored some years ago by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN]. Hence I shall support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT].

I am also disturbed about the restrictive language with reference to vocational rehabilitation funds and trust that the parliamentary situation will permit our striking out the language which substantially limits the provisions for Federal participation in this highly important program. It seems to me that we should not hesitate to approve sufficient funds to maintain the 1955 program at the present level. Again I can

speak with some familiarity of the situation in Arkansas, where an impressive job is being done under Federal auspices. Unless an amendment is adopted our State will suffer loss of \$90,000, and we will be unable to provide for many applicants for rehabilitation. Only about one-third of those actually in need of this program are being served under the present schedule.

The House should recognize the proven value of these two services by adopting amendments to provide the slight increases proposed by the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUSBEY: Page 14, line 21, strike out "\$18,199,511" and insert in lieu thereof "\$23,498,261."

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, this merely takes into consideration the action of the House on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia, because if this perfecting amendment were not adopted there would be no money to meet the increase.

Mr. ABBITT. May I say to the gentleman, if he will yield, that I had a similar perfecting amendment. I appreciate the gentleman's action.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARSHALL: Page 14, line 22, after the word "year" strike out the colon and the language "Provided further, That not more than \$450,000 of this appropriation shall be available for vocational education in distributive occupations" and insert a period.

(Mr. MARSHALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, in many ways the amendment which I am offering is a perfecting amendment. I hope the Committee sees fit on the basis of what has transpired to accept my amendment on that basis.

What we are doing here is to remove a limitation placed on the appropriation which is discriminatory in its effect on distributive education. Between one-third and one-half of the people of this country make their livelihood in the field of merchandising and trade. It seems to me, therefore, that it behooves us to accept the formula which was wisely provided under the George-Barden Act in order that this program can be used to the utmost advantage.

There have been people in this country unfortunately who have looked upon vocational education as affecting only agricultural areas, whereas that is not the fact and the program was never intended for that purpose. The program was authorized and enacted for the purpose of assisting people who make their livelihood in industry.

Distributive education is a very valuable part of the program.

In order that the people may understand the situation I would like to quote some figures which I think will justify removing this restrictive language. Under the distribution proposed, agriculture would receive approximately \$8 million, home economics would receive approximately \$6,500,000, mechanic trades and industry would receive a trifle over \$6,500,000. This would then leave for distributive education in the trades and occupations at which approximately one-third to one-half of the people of the country make their living, \$2 million.

It would seem to me that the legislative committee of this House which proposed the language in the George-Barden Act—and the George-Barden Act has been considered to be outstanding in the field—very wisely provided a fair formula of distribution of the funds.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I want to commend my colleague from Minnesota for offering this amendment. I especially appreciate the fact that he comes from an almost entirely agricultural district, yet recognizes the importance of vocational education in the distributive trades and occupations. I happen to come from a wholly city district. There are 8 high schools in my district which carry on vocational education of this sort; in fact, it is so important that we have 1 high school which is dedicated entirely to vocational training, including adults in night schools. The restriction in the bill which his amendment would remove, makes it impossible for even a reasonable share of the funds to be used for the training of both adults and youth in distributive trades. That restriction is exceedingly unwise.

I hope the gentleman's amendment will be adopted.

Mr. MARSHALL. I thank my colleague from Minnesota.

It is true that in districts such as mine, predominantly agricultural, the importance of distributive education is sometimes overlooked. I would like to read to the House part of a letter from the president of one of the oldest and most prominent department stores in my district, Mr. Victor C. Fandel, of St. Cloud, Minn. The Fandel Co. serves the largest city of my district and the large rural area around it, and has built up over the years a reputation as a business institution of integrity with a real interest in community service, and particularly in the young people of the community. Mr. Fandel has this to say:

We feel that this item should have equal consideration for funds, as well as home economics, agriculture, and other phases of this program.

Congressmen evidently do not realize how much this program helps youngsters who cannot go to college. In our small institution we have from 4 to 7 of these high school people working part-time to help them through this course and partially prepare them for other jobs in the business world.

There is no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that this opportunity exists in many other

communities serving a rural population, and all of us have an interest in helping young people learn the trade and occupation of their choice.

I would say, also, to the gentleman from Minnesota I have long recognized that agricultural programs are a part of the programs of this great country of ours. When we have programs which are good programs, such as these vocational-education programs, it behooves us to make the great benefits of the programs available to all of the people of the country. One of the great problems that this country faces, one that we are hearing a lot about presently, is the problem of marketing our goods. That is one of the primary problems facing the farmers of this country. It is the matter of distribution. How can we do anything which will be of any greater assistance to the people of this country presently than to have a good distribution system? That is a place where our country recognizes a need. When the committee put into effect a limitation on the appropriation bill we did not have the marketing problem that we have now.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. How much would be spent for this purpose if the gentleman's amendment prevailed?

Mr. MARSHALL. Out of the \$23 million, at the most about \$2 million.

Mr. HARRIS. About \$2 million, which would be taken from the \$23 million plus that has just been agreed to for vocational education purposes?

Mr. MARSHALL. It is all vocational education.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Perfecting amendment offered by Mr. TRIMBLE to the amendment offered by Mr. MARSHALL: On page 14, line 23, strike "\$450,000" and insert "\$900,000."

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary for me to argue here for vocational education, because this committee has already demonstrated its feeling in reference to that matter. Neither is it necessary for me to argue the benefits of distributive education, which, in brief, simply is the training of those in the distribution services in our high schools.

For instance, let us take three boys in a high school. One is at his desk taking vocational training, another is taking vocational training also, say in the mechanical field; but in front of those two boys is another boy who is perhaps working his way through high school as a clerk in a store. He cannot benefit under this proposition unless a sufficient amount of money is set aside out of the original appropriation to permit that to be done.

The perfecting amendment which I have offered raises this provision which the committee has inserted to \$900,000, which will give the States the minimum amount.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. May I say to the gentleman from Arkansas that I personally will accept his amendment. I cannot speak for the committee as a whole, but only for myself.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. ABBITT. I would like to say that I think the substitute will take care of the situation in exactly the same way as was done last year when it was restored here in the Committee of the Whole. I hope the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE] will be acceptable to the members of the committee here.

Mr. TRIMBLE. I thank the gentleman very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, was the last vote on the amendment as amended?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARRIS. In reference to the vote on the amendment that has just occurred, did I understand the Chair to rule that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota was adopted?

The CHAIRMAN. The Marshall amendment was adopted.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARRIS. Then the amendment just offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE], which was adopted, was superseded by the action of the committee on the Marshall amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct. It strikes out the proviso.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BUDGE. I was on my feet seeking recognition at the time the Chair announced the vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota. I now propound this parliamentary inquiry. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota was to strike out the language now contained in the bill. The substitute amendment which was adopted merely changed the existing language in the bill. Now, is it the Chair's interpretation that the limitation remains in the bill and is raised from \$450,000 to \$900,000?

The CHAIRMAN. No. The Marshall amendment strikes out the whole language.

Mr. BUDGE. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division. I was on my feet seeking recognition at the time the Chair ruled.

The CHAIRMAN. As long as the gentleman states he was on his feet at the time, the Chair will say that he acted hastily and will recognize the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE].

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the amendment which was offered by the gentleman from Arkansas is in line with the increase which has been made by the Committee of the Whole House in this appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. I understood the gentleman asked for a division.

Mr. BUDGE. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. All the Chair can do is to entertain a demand for a division.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division on the vote by which the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota was adopted.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. Here is the parliamentary situation. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] offered an amendment to strike out. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE] offered an amendment which was entitled to precedence over the other because it was a perfecting amendment. Therefore, the amendment could be considered, and if it was adopted, then the motion relating to the whole paragraph would be in order. Is that not correct?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. TABER. That is the situation we are in at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman asked for a division then on the Marshall amendment. Is that request in order?

The CHAIRMAN. It is in order.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ABBITT. If the amendment is defeated, then the proviso will provide \$900,000 instead of \$450,000 as written in the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. That is right.

Mr. ABBITT. So if we want to adopt the proposal as offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE], increasing on line 23 the amount from \$450,000 to \$900,000, the thing to do would be to vote "No."

The CHAIRMAN. That is right.

Mr. ABBITT. That would put it in exactly as it was last year.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARY. On the other hand, if you want distributive education to receive approximately \$2 million then the vote should be "aye."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BUDGE) there were—ayes 18, noes 96.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico): For payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico) in accordance with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended (29 U. S. C., ch. 4) including payments, in accordance with regulations of the Secretary, for one-half of necessary expenditures for the acquisition of vending stands or other equipment in accordance with section 3 (a) (3) (C) of said act for the use of blind persons, such stands or other equipment to be controlled by the State agency, \$21,000,000, of which not to exceed \$160,000 shall be available to the Secretary for providing rehabilitation services to disabled residents of the District of Columbia, as authorized by section 6 of said act, which latter amount shall be available for administrative expenses in connection with providing such services in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That not to exceed 15 percent of the appropriation shall be used for administrative purposes: *Provided further*, That the funds herein appropriated shall be apportioned among the States in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary to insure equitable maintenance and improvement of State programs; and the obligation of the United States to any State under such act for the current fiscal year shall not exceed the amount so apportioned to such State.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: Page 17, line 15, strike out "shall be apportioned among the" and strike out all of lines 16 through 20, inclusive, and in lieu thereof insert the following: "shall be made available to the States in accordance with the provisions of section 3 (a) of Public Law 113, 78th Congress, approved July 6, 1943."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. The point is that it changes existing law. In the bill for last year, there was a provision on page 7 as follows:

Provided further, That the amount apportioned to a State for fiscal year 1955 shall not exceed \$1 for each 75 cents contributed by the State for the same purpose.

This amendment would wipe out that change that was made by the bill last year and it would result in going back to the old law which was in force prior to this time. It was put in for the purpose of protecting the school districts that were contributing and matching funds against those that were not.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FOGARTY. I do, Mr. Chairman.

It is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that the provision in the bill requires that the grants to States be made in accordance with the regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. My amendment would change this requirement of the bill so that the grants would be apportioned to the States as required under the basic law, Public Law 113, passed in 1943 by the 78th Congress. Further, it is my understanding that you can always require that an appropriation be spent in accordance with the law. All my amendment does is get us back to the basic law and take care of a situation that was put into a bill by the other body but was never brought up for discussion before this House.

Further, Mr. Chairman, my amendment amends the bill, starting on page 17 in line 15. I do not believe the point of order is well taken, because if a point of order lies against the language in my amendment a point of order also should lie against the language in the bill. Therefore, I submit that my language is germane and that it does not change the basic law. All I am trying to do is get back to the basic law that was passed in 1943 by the 78th Congress.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard further on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The basic law is the provision that was passed last year. The original basic law is not the basic law any longer.

I cite Cannon's Precedents, 1936, volume 7, with reference to the suggestion the gentleman from Rhode Island has made with regard to an amendment. I read the bottom paragraph on page 679:

A paragraph proposing legislation but permitted to remain in an appropriation bill may be perfected by germane amendments, but an amendment providing additional legislation is not in order.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard briefly on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. If, as the gentleman from New York says, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island is not germane and is out of order, then why is the language in order that is in the proviso now in the bill? If the law as passed last year exists without this proviso, how can the bill then say:

Provided further, That the funds herein appropriated shall be apportioned among the States in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary.

If that is the law, why do we have to write it in here? To write in directions as to how this shall be spent seems to me just as much out of order as the gentleman from New York says the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island is out of order.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. I think the point made by the gentleman from Minnesota is inappropriate at this time because no point

of order was made in time to the language to which he referred.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. NICHOLSON). The Chair is prepared to rule. The matter referred to by the gentleman from New York came up last year in the committee of conference between the House and the other body. The other body proposed and the House agreed to a provision relating to apportionment of funds in fiscal 1955. There are several applicable precedents. A precedent representative of the situation here is to be found in Cannon's Precedent of the House of Representatives, volume 7, section 1420, which is as follows:

1420. A paragraph changing existing law being permitted to remain by general consent may be perfected by germane amendments which do not provide additional legislation.

It is well established that if a legislative provision is permitted to remain in an appropriation bill, it may be amended by a germane proposition which does not add further legislation. This amendment provides a method of apportionment different from what is specified in the pending bill. It deals with money in the bill and its apportionment. Therefore, it is germane. The provision in the bill certainly grants wide, discretionary power to the Secretary of the Department as to how money in the paragraph shall be apportioned among the States, and under this provisions of the bill the Secretary seems not to be bound by prior laws governing the matter. The pending amendment is also legislation, but it would narrow authority granted by the bill, and would confine the Secretary to the provisions of an existing law. Therefore the amendment does not add further legislation, and, as already stated, it is germane. In the opinion of the Chair, the amendment is in order. Therefore the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the Chairman's ruling. As I said yesterday, I think we can always expect a fair ruling from my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, who served so ably in this position a year ago when this bill was before us.

Mr. Chairman, my only purpose in offering this amendment at this time is to strike some restrictive language which was put into this bill a year ago by the other body, and which was agreed to by the conferees of the House. Those of you who have served on conference committees know, and as many of you as a matter of fact know, when a conference report is reported back to the House with these amendments in disagreement, they are generally passed fairly quickly unless some objection is made to a particular amendment. I was not able to be here when this bill went to conference last year, and I was not present at the conference when the report was reported to the House of Representatives. However, had I been, I certainly would have objected to this particular language in changing the basic law of the vocational rehabilitation program. What does this language mean? In effect, it means as was testified by those who are running

the program and by those on the outside who are interested in the rehabilitation of our handicapped people in this country, that about 5,900 people will not be rehabilitated next year under this program providing for 65,000, if this language is allowed to remain in the bill. I hope because of the tremendous pluralities by which these amendments have been agreed to in past years by men and women on both sides of the aisle in this House by which we have been able to keep this program nonpartisan and to keep politics out of it and we will continue to do so. Because it does not make any difference whether you have a dime or a million dollars, and it does not make any difference whether you are a Democrat, or a Republican, or a Socialist, you can have the same misfortune as the thousands of handicapped have at the present time. It is true that under this program we are now rehabilitating 65,000 people a year, and as I said before many times, the people who have appeared before our committee testifying on these appropriations have testified year after year that for every Federal dollar we appropriate in this particular program, the Federal Government receives in return \$10.

Now, if we are interested in economy, if we are interested in rehabilitating these people and giving them a chance to win their own way in life, this is the place we can do it. It is Federal responsibility. The Federal Government has to provide the leadership for the States, and it would be very unfair at this time to demand that the States match every Federal dollar with 75 cents, because most of the State legislatures have already met and adjourned, and they will not match 75 cents to the dollar. In many States they cannot match it anyway. But the cold facts are that if we do not adopt this amendment to eliminate the restrictive language that was put in by the Senate last year in this matching formula, it means that nearly 6,000 people who would have been rehabilitated in fiscal 1955 will not be rehabilitated. If there was anything any more popular than this program, I do not know what it is. If there is a program in the Federal Government that has meant more in dollars and cents to the Treasury of the United States, I do not know what it is. I could go into States and communities and tell you that for every person that is rehabilitated the return to the local communities and States, themselves is 3 or 4 times what it is to the Federal Government, because many of those unfortunates are on relief rolls, and when we rehabilitate them and they get a job so that they can earn their own way in life, they are taken off the relief rolls. They are taxpayers and they contribute taxes on the State level and on the national level.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. RAYBURN), the gentleman's time was extended 5 minutes.)

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman. I will not take the 5 minutes, because I think this program is well estab-

lished. I think everyone knows what the intent of this language change is.

I now am happy to yield to my distinguished leader, the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I simply wanted to say that I am for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island. I am not given to complimenting people on this floor, as everybody who has served with me knows, but on yesterday I heard the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] make one of the most powerful and convincing speeches and arguments that I have listened to since I have been a Member of this House. I want to congratulate him on the tremendous amount of work he has done on this measure and on the sane and sound fashion by which he has approached this great problem that touches so many unfortunate people in our country.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to see the gentleman from Rhode Island on the floor today presenting the case for public health which he has done so earnestly and capably for the past several years.

It gives me great pleasure because a year ago today he himself was struck down with a heart attack that took him to Bethesda Hospital. For a while we were gravely concerned for him, not knowing how serious his illness was and how long we and the people of Rhode Island would be without his good and faithful service.

Today, however, we can rejoice because not only is he back among us but he is stronger, more capable, and more formidable than ever.

I have known JOHN FOGARTY for the 12 years I have been a Member of Congress. There is nobody in this House for whom I have greater admiration. His sincerity, honesty, and integrity have earned for him the respect of the membership on both sides of the aisle. I hope the people of Rhode Island realize their good fortune in having him as their Representative and I hope, too, that we will enjoy his membership in this body for many years to come.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to hear the remarks made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania about our distinguished friend from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] because I know that all of the Members join with the gentleman from Pennsylvania in the remarks he has just made.

As I stand here due to the generosity of the gentleman from Pennsylvania in yielding to me, my mind goes back not so many years ago to the time when this particular appropriation bill was under consideration and the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] was in the well. Shoulder to shoulder with him

was that distinguished late colleague of ours from Wisconsin, Frank Keefe.

The people of the United States will forever be indebted to both JOHN FOGARTY and Frank Keefe for the dynamic efforts both of them made in behalf of the ill, the sick, and the handicapped.

Mr. GAVIN. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his fine sentiments.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. We representatives from California are delighted to see JOHN FOGARTY back at his desk and working with his committee, because we know that he contributes sincerely efforts of great value to the appropriations this particular subcommittee handles, particularly that part relating to the health of the population.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I took occasion in general debate to pay my respects to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], for all the work he has done and for the knowledge he has brought to this committee and to the health and welfare of this country. He has been invaluable to me as chairman of this committee for the past 2 years.

Mr. GAVIN. I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the opportunity that the gentleman from Pennsylvania gives me to thank him and the other members of this body for the fine words they are saying about my colleague. We in Rhode Island have known these things for many years, and that is why John Fogarty keeps coming back to the Congress. I am glad that his qualifications for this job are being recognized and recognized publicly by all of his colleagues in the House. I thank all of the gentlemen for their kind statements.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much what the gentleman from Pennsylvania and other Members of the House on both sides of the aisle have had to say with reference to John Fogarty.

I as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce handling the authorizing legislation for all these public health programs want to add my word. I feel sure that I speak for all of the Members on both sides in expressing our very deep gratitude for the very able services JOHN FOGARTY has rendered; and, also, in other days the great gentleman from Wisconsin, the Honorable Frank Keefe.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly concur in the remarks concerning the fine thing it is that JOHN FOGARTY is back with us. We were unhappy that he had a very serious illness last year.

The fact, however, that we are glad to see him back with us does not necessarily mean that we have to agree with this particular amendment, and I do rise at this time to voice an objection to the amendment and urge that it be disapproved.

We ought to understand what this amendment does. It provides that a provision in Public Law 170 of the first session of this Congress be stricken. In other words, the States will not have to match on a ratio of 75 cents to every dollar of Federal contribution. Personally, I think that provision is sound and I see no reason whatsoever why the States should not be forced to make a more adequate contribution to this program. It is desirable from the point of view of the Federal Government. At the same time it is equally desirable, if not more so, from the point of view of the individual States. If it is, why should they not make a greater contribution?

The gentleman from Rhode Island himself a few minutes ago in the well of the House stated—I cannot quote him exactly—that the benefits that would accrue to the States would be almost inestimable. If that is the case, and I am sure it is, why cannot the States make a contribution more nearly equal to what the Federal Government contributes? All of the States I know of are in better fiscal shape, better fiscal condition, than the Federal Treasury. If that is the case why can they not step up and make their contributions and share up to their responsibility?

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I first want to join in expressing the thankfulness and happiness we all feel at the restoration to good health and active duty of JOHN FOGARTY, who has served so long and ably on this important subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, following the remarks of my good friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], the question might be raised, if we did not examine the situation, why not allow the restriction to stand that was put in the appropriation bill last year and which reduces the share of the Federal Government under these programs from the present 64 percent to about 57 percent? The hard fact is that 35 or 36 State legislatures do not meet this year. They will not have a chance to increase their contributions. The only possible result will be to cut down the amount of rehabilitation done this next year.

This program was enacted into law in the first year I was in Congress and was a member of the Committee on Education, of which the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] was chairman. I have been proud of the bill as the first on which I ever worked as a Member of this body. The bill provided that all of the administrative and guidance costs plus half of the service costs of the program were to

be furnished by the Federal Government. So it never was possible for the States to get to a 50-50 basis. In the beginning about 72 percent of the costs were paid by the Federal Government and 28 percent by the States. The States have steadily increased their contributions, so that they are now providing about 36 percent and the Federal Government 64 percent. The rider of last year forces the Federal Government down to 57 percent at a time when the legislatures are not meeting and do not have a chance to increase their contributions.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. But this was passed last year and took effect on the 1st of July.

Mr. JUDD. That is right. Almost all of the legislatures had already met last year. As has been said by the gentleman from Rhode Island, this provision was adopted in the conference. It was not in the House bill, it was not in the Senate bill, there was nothing about it in the conference report, it was not explained or discussed when the conference report came before the House. I venture there were not a dozen Members of the House who had any idea the final appropriation bill last year contained legislation which made it impossible with the practical situation that existed to carry on the program even as it was, let alone expanding it as it deserved to be expanded.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. I just interrupt the gentleman to make the remark that I understand that 38 State legislatures have not had the opportunity of taking care of this situation. Many of them will not meet until next January.

Mr. JUDD. That is two worse than the figure I had.

The next point is that somebody may say: Well, the House and Senate Committees on Education and Labor are now working on bills to establish a new policy for this program whereby there will be a gradual reduction of the Federal share and an increase in the State share. Since the new legislation may come before us prior to the end of this session, why make this change in the appropriation bill?

Everybody knows what can happen to pieces of legislation that are not yet out of committee in either House and which have to go through both bodies, in the crowded weeks at the end of a session. It would be exceedingly uncertain and unwise to depend on new legislation rather than upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island to remove this restrictive provision which was put in without the knowledge of the great majority of the Members of the Congress or the people of the country.

Now, that is the technical situation requiring adoption of the amendment. But more important than the technical situation is the human situation. Six thousand handicapped persons will not get vocational rehabilitation during the coming year unless this amendment is adopted; and worse than that, about

1,000 of them will stay on the public relief rolls. To vote against the Fogarty amendment is to vote to keep 1,000 persons getting Government handouts or Community Chest handouts or municipal handouts, or whatever takes care of them on the relief rolls. That costs more in most cases than to teach them skills that will enable them to support themselves.

This is a program which converts tax eaters into taxpayers. We save more money by this program, I believe, in proportion to the amount spent than by any single program that the United States Government has.

I do not think any more argument is necessary. Congress has been for this program each year. It has always supported it. We had this same sort of a wrangle last year and overwhelmingly voted to increase the appropriation. By striking out the restrictive language and increasing the appropriation to \$23 million we can carry out the program without disruption and in accord with the administration program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

(Mr. JUDD (at the request of Mr. JAVITS) was granted permission to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Before posing my question to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, I should like to state that I support his position on this issue.

I should also like to read the wire sent me by Mr. Leonard Rockower, who is the president of the New York Rehabilitation Association. Mr. Rockower says:

Disastrous if vocational rehabilitation appropriation not restored tomorrow and restrictive language removed. Urgently request support.

The situation has been similarly called to my attention by Mrs. Ann Lee Jacobs, distinguished chairman of Youth Aid, Inc., an important voluntary youth organization and a leader in the fight against juvenile delinquency in New York City.

The gentleman feels, does he not, that if you were going to cut off these people by a deliberate policy, you ought to at least give enough notice so that the States could take up the slack? What you are doing now, you are just cutting them off, period.

Mr. JUDD. That is right. It is not the orderly way to do business, and it cripples a program that everybody is for.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. The subcommittee cannot argue that they were not advised of this situation. I appeared before them Friday a week ago, and two-thirds of the time I spent with the committee was discussing this restrictive language. I pointed out to them that it cost the State of West Virginia \$156,000; that our State legislature only meets biennially, and we had no way of replacing those moneys even if the legis-

lature was inclined to do so, and the program would suffer for the first 6 months of the new fiscal year. I think that the proposal by the gentleman from Rhode Island is the way out of it, and we can restore Public Law 113.

Mr. JUDD. Let me say one further thing in the time I have left. Unless this amendment is passed, the \$21 million appropriated in the bill cannot be used because only about \$14 million has been provided by the various State legislatures, and under the matching basis contained in this restriction only about \$19 million can be used. So, actually, we are misleading the public when they think they are going to get the \$21 million in the bill. The only way to meet the need is to increase the amount to \$23 million and remove the restrictive proviso.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, this restriction has resulted in an unequal distribution of the money to the States.

Mr. JUDD. That is right, and the amendment will correct the situation.

Mr. BAILEY. It varied from 54 percent in some States to 72.4 in others.

Mr. JUDD. That is exactly right.

Mr. BAILEY. And we should avoid that.

Mr. Warburton. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. Warburton. I would like to associate myself with the views expressed by the gentleman from Minnesota in his presentation and also to state a point that may be of interest to him, and that is upon the question of whether or not there has been a decline in Federal contributions. I have the figures for the State of Delaware, which led the Nation for the last 7 years in this program, which indicate that in the period since 1951 there has been a steady decline in Federal contributions from 69.62 and it will still go down with this restriction in.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am strongly in favor of this amendment as I was in the committee. In the subcommittee I gained the impression that a majority was for the amendment, although I may be wrong about that, since the question there was really not decided on its merits. You know, I am rather new on this committee, but in the long weeks that I have had the privilege of serving with the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty] I have learned from him many, many things, and I am continuing to learn them. In the subcommittee the question was raised as to whether or not this amendment would be subject to a point of order as legislation on an appropriation bill. The lawyers in the department and the two lawyers on the subcommittee were of the opinion that it would be, and we did not put it in the bill. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty] contended that it was not. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty] is not a lawyer, but he is a great parliamentarian, and today, again, he has taught me some-

thing. He has taught me that whether language is subject to a point of order sometimes depends on the parliamentary maneuver utilized to present it. He has also taught me that no language can be held subject to a point of order until the Chair says "I am prepared to rule." I heartily congratulate him on winning singlehanded what many of us thought would be a hopeless task. It is, indeed, a signal victory.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, the last 3 minutes to be reserved to the chairman of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. TOLLEFSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD following the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL].)

(Mr. CRETELLA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD following the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL].)

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty]. Tomorrow the full Committee on Education and Labor of the House will take up a bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. When I started hearings and had executive sessions in the subcommittee on this subject, I was not too familiar with the various angles of it. The more I have delved into it, the more I realize that it is one of the most worthwhile programs anyone could consider; also that it is a program that has not commanded enough attention here in Congress or in the States or in the various sections of the Nation.

It is absolutely true that it has more parts to commend it than virtually any other type of problem I can think of. Not only do you find the heart interest, in that you help human beings to become self-reliant, self-supporting, but you have a good, economic reason; that is, that they will get off the relief rolls and become self-supporting, thereby returning many thousands of dollars to the Treasury of the United States.

Everything that we can do to help this program should be done. I will tell you what the crux of this whole argument is and what this amendment involves at the present time. In 1954, early in the year, an amendment was passed which required a much higher matching on the part of the States. I would have no objection to that normally if this were a good, functioning program and we were on top of the problem. But we are not. When you consider the size of the problem, with millions and millions of people physically handicapped in this country and the Federal Government putting up only about \$23 million, you will realize that

we are not handling the problem effectively. Therefore there has to be continually more incentive in all directions in order that we may solve this problem and put a large number of worthwhile people to earning a living and helping in the productive effort of this country in a time of great national danger.

Therefore I believe that we should pass this amendment—and the new bill, if it passes, as I hope it will, will continue a higher payment by the Federal Government in order to provide an incentive for the entire program.

I feel very strongly that there is a poor psychological reaction engendered when you talk about cutting down the Federal contribution to a cause which is so worthwhile and which we have not begun to really solve. Therefore, I feel that there should be no discussion yet, at the present time or over the next few years, about cutting down the Federal share of contribution. I think we should make every move to encourage more effort to rehabilitate the physically handicapped people.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be supported, and I hope also that the Members will support the sincere efforts of the Committee on Education and Labor to work out a better program in the future than we have at the present time.

(Mr. McCONNELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(Mr. FENTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The Federal Government's 1954 appropriation bill has made it plain that in 1955, and thereafter, unless changed, States can expect only \$1 for each 75 cents they expend. This reduction was approved under the Busbey amendment and overall will reduce the Federal appropriation from \$23 million to about \$19 million or from 66 percent to 57 percent for vocational rehabilitation. For Pennsylvania it will mean a loss of \$200,000.

The present appropriation for Pennsylvania is broken down as follows:

Federal, 60.7 percent.....	\$1,389,208
State, 39.3 percent.....	900,000

Under the Busbey amendment:

Federal, 57 percent.....	\$1,193,000
State, 43 percent.....	900,000

EARNINGS OF THE HANDICAPPED

During the 1952-53 fiscal year the Pennsylvania Bureau of Rehabilitation closed 3,493 cases as successfully rehabilitated. The combined earnings of the 3,493 persons are estimated at \$7.5 million per year. When accepted for service only 658 persons were receiving wages amounting to \$1.2 million per year. Through rehabilitation the overall income of the State was increased approximately \$6.3 million a year.

More than 17 percent of those rehabilitated, or 610 persons, were dependent upon public relief as their major source of support at time of acceptance. The 610 public-assistance rehabilitants were

receiving \$558,480 a year in relief grants. They are now productive members of their communities, earning \$1,325,740 in their first year of employment. The \$148,505 expended to rehabilitate these persons, a one-time expenditure, is only one-quarter of the cost to maintain them on relief for 1 year.

With the rehabilitation funds to be made available through the Busbey amendment, the number of handicapped individuals who could be rehabilitated in a year would be reduced from 3,493 to 2,941, or a drop of 552 cases. In other words, the earnings lost by State citizens for 1 year as a result of a decrease of 552 rehabilitations would amount to \$1,185,144.

Since there will not be a meeting of the Pennsylvania State Legislature until January 1955, it will be impossible to obtain funds to offset the reduction in Federal appropriations provided under the Busbey amendment.

It seems to me that with such fine work being done in rehabilitating our disabled citizens that the restrictive language in the bill should be removed.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

[Mr. GROSS addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Chairman, I lend my wholehearted support to the amendment proposed by my colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], which would increase the amount for vocational rehabilitation to \$23 million. The various States in our Union, including the Territories are making noteworthy progress in the field of vocational rehabilitation. The Federal Government in matching State funds has made it possible for this all-important work to be carried on. The Vocational Rehabilitation Act was brought into operation to insure equitable maintenance and improvement of State programs. The amendment offered here would increase these very modest funds for a worthy program. Adequate appropriation for the rehabilitation of our Nation's needy population should be an obligation welcomed by our Federal Government. This amendment would return thousands of dollars to the Federal Government, and will help rehabilitate thousands of people so as to make them self-supporting instead of depending on relief all through no fault of theirs.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. It should have the support of the entire House. When the restrictive language was placed in the appropriation bill last year by the House and Senate conferees it was done without full understanding as to its effect and without the knowledge of the vast majority of the Members of either body. This language was not discussed when the conference report came to the floor of the House for consideration. If it had been discussed or even mentioned, I am sure the House would have rejected

it. The debate thus far on this item so indicates.

The effect of this language is unfair to the States who have over the years increased their contributions to this program. It is unfair because it will result in a reduction of the funds to be allocated to the States prior to the time their legislatures will have an opportunity to meet and do something about it.

In addition to that fact I want to say that the pro rata share of the Federal Government should not be reduced. This vocational rehabilitation program is one which needs the guidance and encouragement of the Government. I am afraid that if it is left entirely up to the States at this point the program would not be as effective as it should be in many areas. It may be possible at some future date, when the program is more fully developed, that the Federal share may safely be reduced or eliminated—but certainly such is not the case now.

It is my understanding that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] will offer another amendment immediately after the pending one which would increase the Federal share from \$21 million to \$23 million. I shall support that amendment also, and urge the House to do likewise. I hope both amendments carry.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD].

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment and the amendment to follow which will restore the appropriation to \$23 million. In my judgment, there is no better investment of Federal tax dollars than in the rehabilitation of the handicapped. I do not speak from theory, but from actual observation of rehabilitation work being carried on and from actual knowledge of crippled people who have been rehabilitated as a result of the combined efforts of the various States and the Federal Government. It seems to me that this would be about the last of all Federal activities which any Member of Congress would care to cut.

As I remember, the House committee in 1953 recommended a cut in rehabilitation funds for 1954. This effort to cut rehabilitation was defeated overwhelmingly in the Committee of the Whole of the House. We had thought that this gave plenty of evidence to members of the committee with respect to just how Congress feels about this very important program. Evidently, we were mistaken, for now it appears that not only is an effort to reduce the number of Federal dollars going into the program, but also that restrictive language was placed in the 1954 appropriation bill in conference, effective in 1955, which will limit the Federal share in such a way as to make it impossible for the States to spend even the amount which appears in the 1955 bill.

This restriction will result in a loss of approximately \$75,000 of Federal funds to my own State. This will mean approximately 100 fewer persons rehabilitated. We understand that 7,000 fewer

will be rehabilitated in the country as a whole.

This proposed cut in rehabilitation services comes in the face of a backlog of 2 million severely handicapped people who need rehabilitation services. It ignores the fact that approximately 250,000 persons are added to the severely disabled each year, and that less than one-third of these are receiving rehabilitation services when they first need them. It does not take into consideration the fact that we have an ever mounting public assistance expenditure for the handicapped and that rehabilitation is the main hope of lessening such expenditures. From every conceivable humanitarian or economic viewpoint, it seems extremely unwise for either the States or the Federal Government to decrease their investments in rehabilitation.

With respect to whether the Federal Government is paying too high or too low a part of the total cost of the program, I am willing to leave this to committees of Congress to study such legislation. To attempt to rewrite a law in an appropriation bill, particularly one as complicated as Public Law 113 of the 78th Congress, is extremely unwise and could hardly be expected not to result in severe dislocations and injustices.

I speak for the handicapped of my State in supporting the amendments to restore the funds to \$23 million and repealing the restrictive language.

(Mr. WINSTEAD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to straighten out what I think is a misunderstanding on some things.

First, the gentleman from Minnesota was not sure as to whether or not the \$19 million could be matched. I refer him to page 700 of the hearings, where Mr. Hunt, Assistant Director of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, testified, as follows:

The highest figure would be about \$15 million of State funds. That would bring about \$20 million of Federal funds.

The reason the committee raised the budget request to \$21 million was so that if the States raised just \$750,000 more, above the \$15 million, they could match the \$21 million on a 75 cents to a dollar basis and, in total, there would be just as much available for the program as they had in 1954.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania was talking about State legislatures not being in session. As I pointed out in general debate yesterday, there is no right year for any such legislation as this, because if you make it effective this year, the State legislatures are not in session. If you try to make it effective next year, the State legislatures will have convened and adjourned before the appropriation bills get through the Congress, so that would not be the right year. There is just no right year.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: Page 17, line 6, strike out "\$21,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$23,000,000"; and in line 7 strike out "\$160,000" and in lieu thereof insert "\$195,000."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, all this amendment does is restore the funds we had available in this fiscal year of 1954. If this amendment is agreed to, we will then be guaranteeing the physically handicapped that they will have as much in 1955 as they had in 1954. That is all it does.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read down to and including page 18, line 14.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NICHOLSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9447) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GRANTS TO STATES FOR UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, before this bill is passed, I want to remind the House of a serious weakness in the provisions pertaining to grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment-service administration.

For grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration, the President requested \$216.4 million, made up of \$210.4 million basic and \$6 million contingency. The House Appropriations Committee accepted the total of \$216.4 million, but altered the distribution between basic and contingency. The committee recommended \$200 million basic and \$16.4 million contingency.

The committee stated that the \$200 million basic would be adequate to finance a workload equivalent to the workload experienced in 1954. The States will spend about \$202 million in 1954. The surface impression is that, since the States will perform their 1954 workloads for \$202 million, the \$200 million basic recommended by the House committee should be adequate to finance the same workloads in 1955. The facts are, however, that if the 1954 workload had been completely paid for the States would spend this year about \$217 million. The appropriation for grants was drastically reduced in 1954, and the States have simply had to absorb a great part of their costs, through reductions in pro-

gram and in the quality of performance. The House committee action will prevent any restoration in program or quality of operation. The employment service will be particularly affected at a time when every effort should be made to strengthen and improve the process of getting workers in jobs. With the amount of funds available, it is almost certain that complaints on the lag in the payment of benefits that have been made in large numbers during the past year, will continue. At the same time plans to improve operations in the area of improper benefit payments and the stepping up of the field auditing of employers' accounts will not be realizable.

In addition, the House committee refused to permit the use of the contingency fund to pay the costs of general State salary increases. Any such increases in 1955 will have to be absorbed in those States where such increases occur. The effect will be a further reduction in the amount of money available. The best estimate at this time is that the salary increases will amount to a cut of \$6.2 million, or 1,600 jobs.

I had hoped that these weaknesses would be corrected. There still is opportunity to do so before this bill becomes law, and I earnestly hope it will be done.

May I take this opportunity, also, to state that it is highly encouraging to note the action of the committee in adding funds in another section of the bill for vocational education and vocational rehabilitation. These are far reaching and very beneficial steps.

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file a report on Senate bill S. 2475.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on the pending bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS IN THE STATE OF OREGON

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2225) relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I make this reservation at the request of two of our former colleagues, I would like to ask the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] a question. This measure is a followup and confirms a decision of the District of Columbia Circuit of the United States Court of Appeals on April 30, 1954, in which action A. W. Lafferty, a former Member of Congress, represented Clackamas County, Oreg., and others and won the decision. Is this correct?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. That is correct.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Is it a fact that immediately after the said court of appeals decision, the Senate held hearings for 4 days and reported this bill favorably?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. That is correct.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Is it a fact that this bill confirms the decision of the court of appeals which directed the payment of \$7 million or \$8 million to 18 Oregon counties, including Clackamas County, all of which 18 counties thereby benefiting by the action instituted by A. W. Lafferty, as attorney, and benefited from the said court decision? This is correct, is it not?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. That is correct.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Can the gentleman assure me there is no timber grab and no land grab in this bill?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I can assure the gentleman there is no land grab or timber grab. I assure the gentleman that the matter concerns only two Government departments and nobody else.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I thank the gentleman.

Is it correct that if this bill is not passed today you have arranged for a rule on same?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) those unselected and unpatented odd-numbered sections within the indemnity limits of the Oregon and California Railroad land grant authorized by the act of July 25, 1866 (14 Stat. 239), as amended by the act of April 10, 1869 (16 Stat. 47), and for which payment was made by the United States to such railroad or its successors in interest under the act of June 9, 1916 (39 Stat. 218), pursuant to the decree in the case of United States against Oregon and California R. R. Co. (8 F. (2d) 645), which were included within the boundaries of national forests

by proclamations of the President of the United States issued under the dates of June 17, 1892, September 28, 1893, October 5, 1906, January 25, 1907, March 1, 1907, and March 2, 1907, are hereby declared to be revested Oregon and California railroad grant lands; and said lands shall continue to be administered as national-forest lands by the Secretary of Agriculture subject to all laws, rules, and regulations applicable to the national forests: *Provided*, That all revenues hereafter derived from said lands and those revenues heretofore derived from such lands and placed in special deposit by agreement between the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior shall be disposed of in accordance with the provisions of title II of the act approved August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 874) as hereby amended, and said lands shall not hereafter be subject to the provisions of any other laws or parts of laws which otherwise prescribe the disposal or distribution of receipts from lands of the United States, except that none of the provisions of this act shall affect revenues heretofore distributed. No part of said lands or the resources thereof shall be subject to exchange under the provisions of this or any other law applicable to national-forest lands or otherwise.

(b) Subsection (a) of title II of the act approved August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 874), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following proviso: "*Provided, however*, That for the purposes of this subsection the portion of the said revested Oregon and California railroad grant lands in each of said counties which was not assessed for the year 1915 shall be deemed to have been assessed at the average assessed value of the grant lands in said county."

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture are authorized and directed, within 2 years after the enactment of this act, to exchange administrative jurisdiction of revested Oregon and California railroad grant lands lying within the boundaries of any national forest or within 2 miles of such boundaries, and national-forest lands of approximately equal aggregate value, when by such exchange the administration of the lands will be facilitated. Such exchanges shall be made subject to outstanding contracts, permits or other existing rights: *Provided*, That the said national-forest lands, administrative jurisdiction of which is transferred to the Secretary of the Interior, shall be excluded from the national forest and shall become subject to administration under the same provisions of law as the revested lands in exchange for which they were transferred, and the revested lands, administrative jurisdiction of which is transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture, shall become a part of the national forests subject to administration under the laws applicable to national forests: *Provided further*, That subject to the requirement of approximate equal aggregate value for the overall exchange, the revested lands and the national-forest lands, administrative jurisdiction of which is exchanged in any county, shall be approximately equal in area unless otherwise agreed to by the counties concerned. The exchanges provided for herein shall in each case be evidenced by an order signed by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture and such orders shall be transmitted to the Division of the Federal Register for filing and publication.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of consolidating and thereby facilitating administration and accounting the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to designate in the several counties in which the lands described in section 1 of this act are situated (such designation to be published in the Federal Register), an area of national-forest land of a value substantially equal to the value of the lands in such county from which all revenues shall

be disposed of in accordance with the provisions of title II of the act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 874), and upon such designation the provisions of that act shall be applicable to the lands so designated in lieu of the lands described in section 1 of this act: *Provided, however*, That such designation shall not become effective until approved by the county court of the county in which the lands are located.

SEC. 4. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of sections 2 and 3 of this act there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as the Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 5958) was laid on the table.

PENDING LEGISLATION PERTAINING TO O. & C. LANDS

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, legislation pending in Congress having to do with the Oregon and California revested railroad grant lands, otherwise known as the O. & C. lands, is a bill which has as its principal purpose the settling of a dispute between the Department of Interior Bureau of Land Management and the Department of Agriculture Forest Service concerning the jurisdiction over some 462,000 acres in the O. & C. land area. Identical bills are pending in the House and Senate, sponsored by Congressman ELLSWORTH and Senator GUY CORDON, H. R. 5958 and S. 2258.

There is no O. & C. controversy in Congress. The pending legislation is approved by the two departments. The Bureau of the Budget finds no objection to it.

The O. & C. lands are lands granted by Congress in 1866 to the Oregon & California Railroad Co. consisting of every odd-numbered section of land then in the title of the Government lying in a strip 20 miles on each side of the proposed railroad right-of-way. The grant was similar to one of many made at about the same time for the purpose of encouraging railroad construction in the United States. The grant in the 20-mile strip is known as the place grant, but since there was considerable patented land in the place grant of a second strip 10 miles in width adjoining the place grant was set aside in which the railroad company had the right to select lands in odd numbered sections to indemnify it for lands in the place grants to which it could not have title. The lands in these two 10-mile strips were known as indemnity lands; in other words, lands set aside to indemnify the railroad company for lands unavailable to it in the place grant.

The railroad was built. Later the railroad company was discovered to have violated some of the terms of the grant. The violations were considered so serious that the United States brought an action in the Federal court to forfeit the entire unsold portion of the granted lands. The Supreme Court, however, held that the terms of the grant should be enforced by legislation not by judicial decree, but

did enjoin the railroad company from further disposition of the grant lands until Congress should have an opportunity to legislate.

Accordingly, Congress enacted on June 9, 1916, the Chamberlain-Ferris Act, generally known as the Revestment Act. The language in that act said that title to the lands was revested in the United States to all of the unsold portion of the grant land for which patents had been issued to the railroad company or for which that company was entitled to receive patents.

Meanwhile the United States Forest Service was established. Vast acreages of timberlands were withdrawn from all other use and were placed in the forest reserve. Within the boundaries of the forest withdrawals in Oregon were not only some 500,000 acres of O. & C. lands which were patented by the railroad company but within those boundaries were also some 462,000 acres which were in the so-called indemnity strip but which had not actually been patented by the railroad company.

It is concerning this latter unpatented 462,000 acres that the dispute between the two departments arose. The Forest Service contended that since the withdrawal was made before the Revestment Act was passed and since the lands had not been patented by the railroad company before that they were Government lands and, therefore, subject to withdrawal. The Department of Interior O. & C. Administration contended, however, that the railroad company was entitled to patent those lands, had been paid for them, and that these lands therefore, were a part of the O. & C. grant and properly under the jurisdiction of the O. & C. Administration rather than the Forest Service.

What is now known as the O. & C. Administration in the Department of Interior was created by an act of Congress passed in 1937. This act corrected the destructive 10-year timber patent sale system provided in the Revestment Act by requiring that O. & C. timber must be managed on a sustained-yield basis. It set up the O. & C. Administration for the purpose of administering the lands on that basis and provided a new formula for the distribution of the receipts from the lands. Unfortunately, the 1937 act assumed that all lands, both in the place grant and in the indemnity strip to which the railroad company had acquired patent or was entitled to patent, were O. & C. lands and the act did not spell out in detail the status of the 462,000 acres over which the dispute arose.

When the dispute was taken by the departments to the Attorney General, he would give no opinion. It became necessary, therefore, for Congress to determine the status of the disputed lands.

Legislation for this purpose was first introduced by Senator McNary in 1942, and in subsequent Congresses. All of the bills bearing on this subject have been uniform in one respect. They have declared the disputed acreage to be a part of the O. & C. grant. The principal difference of opinion within the Government has been as to the actual physical management of the lands. The bills now

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued June 11, 1954
For actions of June 10, 1954
83rd-2nd, No. 107

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....3,7	Loans, farm.....6	Tobacco quotas.....5
Banking and currency.....9	Reclamation.....8	Trade agreements.....2
Exhibits.....12	Research.....12	Tung oil.....13
Foreign aid.....4,10	Soil conservation.....1	Water resources.....1,11
Housing.....6	Surplus commodities.....4	

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committee voted to report watershed bill. House committee reported trade agreements bill, and Rules Committee cleared it. House Rules Committee cleared surplus commodities bill. House passed Labor-HEW appropriation bill. House Rules Committee voted to report resolution to send housing bill to conference. House recalled tobacco penalty bill to correct date.

SENATE

1. **SOIL CONSERVATION.** The Agriculture and Forestry Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 6788, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and local agencies in the planning and carrying out of works of improvement for soil conservation. The "Daily Digest" states, "Major amendments adopted by the committee would;
 "1. Eliminate requirement that each project be approved by the Senate and House Committees on Agriculture;
 "2. Require that application of local organization for a project be approved by the appropriate State agency, or if no authorized agency, the State governor;
 "3. Require local organizations to acquire land, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for project, but delete provisions requiring them to turn such land and rights over to the Federal Government;
 "4. Require compliance with State water rights laws;
 "5. Require local organizations to secure agreements that not less than 50 percent of the land above a retention reservoir installed with Federal assistance will be treated with proper soil conservation practices;
 "6. Delete authority of the Department of Agriculture to contract for construction of works of improvement in watershed projects;
 "7. Require approval of the Congress of any dams providing between 2,000 and 5,000 acre-feet capacity; and
 "8. Provide that the President shall prescribe rules to assure coordination of the work under the act and related work of other agencies." (p. D661.)

HOUSE

2. **TRADE AGREEMENTS.** The Ways and Means Committee reported without amendment H. R. 9474, to continue the reciprocal trade agreements program for 1 year (H. Rept.

1777)(pp. 7553, 7578). The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of this bill (p. 7578). It is expected that the bill will be debated today (p. D663).

3. LABOR-HEW APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955. Passed with amendments this bill, H. R. 9447 (pp. 7555-74).

4. SURPLUS COMMODITIES. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of S. 2475, which would be known as the "Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954" (p. 7578). This bill provides as follows:

Title I - Sales for Foreign Currency: Authorizes the President to negotiate and carry out agreements with friendly nations or organizations of friendly nations for the sale of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies. Directs CCC, in accordance with directions of the President, to make available surplus agricultural commodities acquired by it; and authorizes letters of commitment to facilitate transactions under the bill through private trade channels. Authorizes appropriations to reimburse CCC for costs of commodities and administration. Limits transactions under this title to \$1 billion and (in general) to June 30, 1957. Permits the President to use these foreign currencies for development of new markets, purchase of materials for stockpiling, procurement of military equipment, goods or services for other friendly countries, increased production for domestic needs in friendly countries, payment of U. S. obligations abroad, foreign loans, etc.

Title II - Famine Relief and Other Assistance: Directs CCC to make available to the President such surplus agricultural commodities as the President may request for transfer to friendly countries or populations for relief purposes. Permits the President to grant surpluses to friendly nations to assist low-income groups through cooperatives. Authorizes use of \$100,000,000 worth of surpluses without regard to title II of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act. Encourages use of voluntary relief agencies. Limits total expenditures under this title to \$300,000,000, and limits the undertaking of new projects to June 30, 1957.

Title III - General Provisions: Authorizes the President to use CCC commodities to relieve distress in the U. S. (1) in areas of acute distress caused by unemployment, etc., if such use will not displace normal marketings, and (2) in connection with major disasters such as floods and tornadoes. Amends Sec. 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 so as to eliminate its limitation to "food" commodities, eliminate the necessity of finding that commodities are in danger of loss through deterioration or spoilage, establishment of barter as a priority disposal method, authority to dispose of commodities to State and Federal penal and correctional institutions and publicly owned hospitals, requirement that such use will not replace normal consumption, permission for advance estimates of available commodities, and authority for CCC to pay reprocessing, packaging, handling, and transportation charges up to time of delivery for distribution or export. Encourages exchanges of surplus agricultural commodities for strategic materials when such exchanges will protect the funds and assets of CCC.

5. TOBACCO QUOTAS. Recalled from the Senate S. 3050, to increase the penalty for excess marketing of tobacco, so as to correct the effective date (p. 7554).

6. HOUSING LOANS. The Rules Committee voted to report a rule to send H. R. 7839, the housing bill, to conference (p. D664). This bill includes a provision to continue the rural-housing program administered by this Department.

7. D. C. APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955. The Appropriations Committee reported without amendment this bill, H. R. 9517 (H. Rept. 1780)(p. 7578).

The committees of the Congress are held in high esteem, and this is as it should be; however, the time has arrived when we must admit that the present hearings have caused the people of this country to lose much of their feelings or respect for the Members of the Congress and for the arduous work of the Congress. The manner in which this hearing has been conducted is calculated to lessen our admiration for our system of government.

None of us would wish to deny the people of their right to know what we are doing in the Congress and I have always felt that it was a healthy situation when our constituents interested themselves in the work of their Congressmen, for certainly the laws we pass affect the everyday living of every man, woman, and child in this great Nation of ours. However, I feel, and very strongly, that it is not a healthy situation for our people to daily look upon the present "show" and conclude that all such workings of the committees of the Congress are carried on in such a manner. In the Congress we have hard-working and conscientious Members who are intensely sincere in expeditiously solving the many problems confronting the Congress today—these men are not concerned with whether or not their pictures are going out every day to the millions of television viewers to decide if they are actors—but they are concerned with whether or not the work they are doing in the Congress is in the best interest of the majority of the people.

I do not believe there is a person within this room who does not agree with me that the most important problem facing this entire Nation today is not whether Private Schine received preferential treatment—nor any of the charges against Senator McCARTHY and his staff or the Army—but I think you will all agree with me—our most important problem today is much more far reaching—whether we can perpetuate our Government and prevent world war III.

It seems to me that our President, our Secretary of State, and our diplomats need the combined cooperation, efforts, and thinking of every Member of this Congress in helping to solve the important problems facing us today.

When my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], was Speaker of the House, he refused to permit the televising of the hearings of the committees of the House and his wisdom in so doing has been demonstrated most forcefully by what has been displayed in the McCarthy-Army hearing for the past 7 weeks.

Mr. Speaker, in order to prevent a repetition of such proceedings, I am today introducing a concurrent resolution which reads as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That (a) no television broadcast shall be made of any hearing or other proceeding held by a committee of Congress.

(b) As used in subsection (a), the term "Committee of Congress" includes any standing, special, or select committee of either House of Congress, any joint committee of Congress, and any subcommittee of any such committee.

I have chosen a concurrent resolution, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of enabling the two Houses to act in conjunction. A simple resolution could have been introduced as an amendment to the rules but the participation by both bodies would demonstrate they are in harmony and working together and not separately in dealing with this problem.

In conclusion, let me say that I think the time has come when we should stop the show that has lasted for 7 weeks as above stated and will possibly go on until the end of this Congress. The Congress ought to do something by acting now.

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

THE BROOKLYN SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION

(Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, once more and for the 125th year there is celebrated in Brooklyn the anniversary of the founding of the Brooklyn Sunday School Union. I wish the world could today be in the great Borough of Brooklyn on its annual holiday of holiness, when the founding of the Brooklyn Sunday School Union is celebrated. Upward of a hundred thousand men, women, and children will parade through the streets of Brooklyn proudly proclaiming their belief in their God.

It would be a heartening sight, Mr. Speaker, for the oppressed peoples of the world to enjoy and revel in such a holiday.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 123, first session of this Congress, I am recorded as not voting. I was present and answered in the affirmative.

Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the RECORD will be corrected accordingly.

There was no objection.

GRANTING PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 455, granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, with a Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 4, after line 15, insert:

"A-6948174, Castillo, Zenoma Martinez do or Zenoma Martinez or Zenoma Martinez-Camejallis.

"A-7046218, Rothstein, Rebecca.

"A-0901104, Tsien, Hsue Chu.

"A-6624888, Tsien, Mrs. Yi Ying (nee Li).

"A-6253121, Liman, Kcrupe Herant.

"A-6384103, Liman, Violet (nee Haki).

"A-5886859, Rynnanen, Eino Olave."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 9447) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 9447, with Mr. NICHOLSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Grants for hospital construction: For payments for hospital construction under part C, title VI, of the act, as amended, to remain available until expended, \$65,000,000: *Provided*, That allotments under such part C to the several States for the current fiscal year shall be made on the basis of an amount equal to the appropriation granted herein.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONAS of Illinois: On page 21, line 7, strike out "\$65,000,000" and insert "\$75,000,000."

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I assume complete responsibility for offering this amendment because I believe it is a good one and worthy of our consideration. I am not carried away with the charge that this amendment is contrary to a program and interferes basically with our hopes and thoughts of adhering strictly to economy or to an economy program. I do not believe you can profit from applying economy to Government operations if you have to economize at the expense of human misery.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to call attention to a number of salient points that enter into the picture relative to this amendment which I think the Members ought to know about. As a matter of fact, every Member of the House is vitally interested in the amendment, and they have already demonstrated this in this manner:

I have in my hand the report of the Hospital Facilities Division up to March 31, 1954. Every State in the Union and all of our Territories have taken advan-

tage of the law which provides funds to improve upon the health of the citizens of our country and to rehabilitate or erect new hospitals. Most of the benefits derived under the terms of this law went to smaller communities. Very few hospitals were erected in areas where the population was beyond 50,000 or 100,000. Most of the benefits went to little cities of 5,000 or more. In some States there were as many as 80 projects since the time this law became effective, all of which were financed to some extent by the Government through this act, known as the Hospitalization Construction Act, with which we are dealing here.

I am not running contrary to the established policy of economizing in the operation of Government. The \$75 million requested was proposed by the authorities that had the sanction and the blessing of the administration.

The President's budget request for fiscal year 1955 includes a request for \$75 million to be allocated to the States and Territories to defray part of the costs of construction of hospitals, public-health centers, and related facilities under the Hospital Survey and Construction Act. The House Appropriations Committee proposed to reduce this amount to \$65 million.

Now, I have no fault to find with the Committee on Appropriations, except they ran into exactly the same situation last year. You might remember that our distinguished chairman of the committee having this legislation in charge today most vociferously and aggressively opposed the appropriation recommended last year, and he succeeded in cutting it down to \$50 million. But the other body increased it to \$65 million, and there is every reason to believe that if we abandon our opportunity to increase this appropriation from \$65 million to \$75 million, that the same proceeding will take place in the other body again.

Let me call your attention to the language in the report of the committee. This report has the following language in it:

There was absolutely no testimony given the committee to indicate that a greater need for Federal hospital construction funds for this program exists now than existed a year ago when the Congress provided \$65 million.

I am merely pointing this out because a year ago my good friend and colleague, the chairman of this committee, pointed out that only \$50 million was required. Now the report says that there is no question but what \$65 million will suffice. The sum of \$75 million is infinitesimal compared to the great work that is being accomplished under this bill.

Let me point out to you that of the \$65 million already appropriated or to be appropriated for the present fiscal year, more than \$51 million has been allocated to 117 projects sponsored, thus less than \$14 million is available for new projects with an almost full year yet to run.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

(Mr. JONAS of Illinois asked and was given permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I also call your attention to this salient fact which deals with the great overall health program of the country. Hearings before the Appropriations Committee revealed that the estimated deficiency of this Nation's hospital bed need is from 694,000 to 813,000 beds in the four basic categories of general, mental, tuberculosis, and chronic. One-fourth of the bed deficiency is in the area of general hospital beds. Two-thirds of the Nation's hospital bed deficiency is made up of mental disease and chronic disease beds and increasing attention must be directed to the construction of these types of hospitals. Similarly, with an increasing emphasis upon larger hospitals and teaching medical centers, integral units of a coordinated hospital system, attention must be directed to their construction.

I am advised that a considerable percentage of our present hospital beds are old, outmoded, and in need of functional modernization and/or replacement. There is, I understand, a backlog of actual projects reported by the States which could utilize \$270 million in Federal funds for fiscal year 1955. Certainly the proposed appropriation of \$65 million seems inadequate.

In recent years hospital construction under the hospital survey and construction program has amounted nationwide to about one-third of our total hospital construction, exclusive of purely Federal construction. Total civilian hospital construction has been at a level which has barely kept up with the increase in population. If the hospital survey and construction program is to be only \$65 million next year, no inroad can be made into the accumulated bed deficiency.

I shall explore for a moment what may be accomplished with an appropriation of \$65 million in fiscal year 1955. The amount would be matched by State and local money for a total program of approximately \$130 to \$145 million. At an average cost figured at \$16,000 each, approximately 8,125 to 9,000 hospital beds would be provided, plus a few public health centers and related health facilities. These facilities, together with hospital construction outside the hospital survey and construction program will not keep up with the bed needs resulting from the increased population and the obsolescence of hospitals. The annual increase in population of over 2,500,000 requires—mark this—a total of 30,000 beds. In addition, each year many thousands of hospital beds become obsolete and need replacement. To cope only with the factors of population increase and obsolescence, there is a need for more than 30,000 beds annually.

It may be pointed out that the matter of taking care of the sick, those who are indigent and ill, is primarily a function of the State. Let us assume there is some merit to that. It has also been pointed out by the chairman in one of his dissertations on the floor of the House in connection with this bill that the States should assume more responsibility. I am prepared to meet that argument in this way; that the States can assume more responsibility just as

soon as we take the Federal tax collector out of our backyard. The State of Illinois is contributing, annually in income taxes alone, \$4 billion to the national Treasury.

The question we are discussing here in the House is one that is of public interest. It is impressed with a public trust. Everybody is interested in health, in preserving and conserving life. The tremendous inroads on hospital facilities brought about by an increase in longevity, because of expanding medical research and increase of hospital facilities, speak for themselves. There are still many institutions and hospitals in this country that are not fit to house patients and which should be rehabilitated or rebuilt.

If we already have \$51 million of the \$65 million that was asked for, that leaves only \$14 million remaining with practically a whole year still to operate in. It seems to me that it is not good economy to deny the people of this country the other \$10 million.

The hospitals are the foundations upon which you build your health program. There is a shortage of nurses in the country because there are not enough facilities provided for them where they can train. There is a shortage of resident physicians. There is a shortage of interns because of the high restrictions of the medical profession in preparing them for their specialties. These people cannot avail themselves of the necessary facilities to carry out the full intent of their educational program, as required by the medical profession, and facilities should be provided for that purpose because of the educational preparation that the law imposes on them, and which they have to meet before they are recognized as graduate doctors and nurses.

In my opinion, it is not economy to take \$10 million out of this bill. I think this is the best investment we can make and I think the House should vote for this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. CANFIELD, the time of Mr. JONAS of Illinois was extended 1 minute.)

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am supporting the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois because of the acute need for more hospitals in our growing country and I am particularly mindful of the real importance of this Federal program's continuance in my own State of New Jersey.

What the gentleman from Illinois asks in his amendment is the amount requested by the President who, I believe, reviewed the need very carefully and very seriously. It is definitely my understanding that the President made his hospital-construction recommendations a most important step in his allover program to improve conditions in the current transition period from a wartime to a peacetime economy.

While we seek to help the distressed in faraway places, while we legislate

and appropriate for measures to cure diseased cattle, while we unite to meet the problems of soil and beach erosion, let us not forget the prime welfare of our No. 1 asset—the American people.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I am glad to get the benefit of the gentleman's statement and his support.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I would like to associate myself with the gentleman's views and state that I shall support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I am very glad to have the gentleman's help.

(Mr. JONAS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(Mr. DEMPSEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD at this point.)

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, it is deeply gratifying to me to find the membership of this House so strongly in favor of providing the funds necessary for such worthy programs as vocational rehabilitation for the handicapped, Federal assistance in expansion of hospital facilities throughout the Nation and for education. To my mind all of these activities should be adequately, even generously, supported for they undoubtedly make a most important and essential contribution to the future security and welfare of our country.

I am indeed glad that the membership of this honorable body has seen fit to reject the unsound proposals that funds for those worthy purposes should be curtailed at this critical time. I wholeheartedly agree with the preceding speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JONAS] in his remarks on the need of adopting the amendment to increase the funds for the hospital program.

In the past few weeks I have heard fervent arguments in favor of sending more and more billions of our American dollars abroad to help the needy and bolster the economies of many foreign nations. Our generosity in that regard seemingly has no bounds. The obligations we assume are likewise virtually unbounded.

But here at home in the dealing with the needs of our own people some of our House leadership has apparently been unable to recognize those needs. They have asked us to cut back sharply the funds for the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, the agency of our Government that seeks to restore to usefulness and self-support the halt, the lame and the blind. We have been asked, in effect, to handicap the already handicapped and to keep them in the unhappy plight of being forever unwilling dependents upon charity, either public or private.

I am not willing to be a party to this parsimonious and inhumane policy. The vast majority of the Members of this House have shown they feel likewise. Those handicapped men, women, and children want to become self-supporting and useful citizens. We talk much about the dignity of man and the purpose of our great Government to maintain that

dignity for all of its citizens. We must be willing to provide the relatively small amount of money required to help our handicapped to acquire and maintain the dignity of independence.

Any doubt that existed in the mind of any Member of this honorable body about the justification for providing every dollar of the funds necessary to rehabilitate the handicapped should have been dispelled by the magnificent presentation made on the floor of this House by our able colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island, Representative FOGARTY. In the many years I have been a Member I never have heard a sounder or better documented presentation. I find myself in complete agreement with him and congratulate him upon the outstanding ability he displayed as a true public servant.

Let us put aside any sentimentalism involved, let us disregard for the moment the moral obligation we owe, and consider the purely economic aspects of this question. We know from extensive surveys and investigations made by various well-informed and competent authorities in the welfare field that there are many thousands of handicapped who are not being rehabilitated because of insufficient funds to do the job. We know full well that they will remain a liability to our Nation so long as they are dependents. It has been shown beyond any question that their rehabilitation will result in an almost immediate financial return to the Nation of at least \$10 for every dollar we devote to their rehabilitation. What better investment can we ask than that? That should be apparent to any of us who are seeking real economy.

No one, I believe, is more zealous than I in demanding true economy and elimination of waste in our Government. Reduction of funds for rehabilitation of our handicapped is not economy. It is, on the other hand, wanton waste—waste of the huge potential benefit we will derive from making additional thousands of our handicapped citizens useful, productive, and self-supporting. We can make them economic assets and, at the same time, enable them to hold their heads high with a new spirit of independence.

We have made great strides in health and education in our Nation. We must continue that progress. To take a negative attitude now will result only in sacrifice of much of the gain we have made. It is gratifying, indeed, to know so many of us are cognizant of that.

I am proud of the forward strides made by the great State of New Mexico which I have the honor to represent. In the last 10 years New Mexico has advanced from a so-called backward State in educational standards to one of the top ranking in the Nation. It stands at the head of the list in ratio of progress made. About 40 percent of the State's income is devoted to various phases of the educational program. That investment is paying huge dividends because New Mexico has been farsighted enough to recognize the soundness of the fundamentals that the gentleman from Rhode Island, Representative FOGARTY, a man of broad experience and proven

ability in this field, presented for our consideration.

These are not purely State and local responsibilities. The children to be educated and the handicapped people to be rehabilitated are citizens or future citizens of the United States of America, as well as of the respective States and communities. There is a joint obligation involved. The States and the communities are ready and willing to assume their share of the responsibility and the cost. We would be most derelict in our duty if we failed to see to it that the Federal Government lives up to its obligation and does the right as well as the smart thing.

Responsibility in this matter does not rest with the Bureau of the Budget or any other executive branch agency. It rests with the Congress. Our responsibility is clearly defined. The most of us are showing that we do not intend to shirk that responsibility.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes, the last 10 minutes to be reserved to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. HARRIS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I see quite a number of Members standing, and I wonder if the gentleman could not extend that time to at least 35 minutes.

Mr. BUSBEY. I amend my unanimous consent request that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 45 minutes. I believe that will take care of everybody.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JONAS].

Beginning last fall the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has conducted a long series of health studies. Quite a number of hearings were held last fall. They were resumed in January and have continued right on up to the present time. The committee has been making an overall study of health conditions in the United States with the end in view of seeking in any way possible through sound legislation to better those conditions.

I feel, Mr. Chairman, that there is no better way to promote and to provide good health services than to follow an orderly, planned system of acquiring hospital facilities and other medical facilities. If we can do this under the provisions of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, then I think we should do it to the maximum of our ability to do so. I go further to say that it has been done in a very successful manner up to this time, that it is being done now, and that we must continue to do it.

Mr. Chairman, indicating the feeling of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce as to the importance of expanding rather than contracting this

program, you may recall that we brought from that committee early in this year a bill that would in effect expand the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, to provide for different categories not included in the original act. That bill, already passed in the House, would authorize \$62 million of appropriations beyond those authorized in the original act for the carrying on of this expanded program.

That issue is not before the House at this time, but a question of \$10 million in order to bring the appropriation for fiscal 1955 up to the recommendation of the President and the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget.

The distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JONAS] has given to the Committee, I believe, all the figures insofar as shortage of beds is concerned, insofar as a lag in construction is concerned and insofar as the need is concerned, that the Committee needs to have at this time in order to make its decision on the pending amendment.

I hope very much that we will adopt this proposal and that it will be subsequently approved when the Committee rises and we go back into the House. I am sure there will be no question there if the amendment is adopted in the Committee of the Whole. The gentleman from Illinois emphasized the present survey indicating the condition of some of our old hospitals. I have a very personal example of that in my own city where, within the last few weeks, it was determined that a municipal hospital known as the Nashville City Hospital, which has been in operation about 60 years, is in such a state of disrepair that it will be necessary to have a complete overhauling of that hospital, or otherwise to transfer the patients to other hospitals. This is a concrete, and for my home city, a very pressing example of what the gentleman from Illinois has said with reference to the age of hospitals.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me may be transferred to the gentleman from Tennessee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I am very happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very happy to yield my time to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] because of his profound knowledge of the subject. I am sufficiently acquainted with it and with the history of this legislation to know the great benefits that flow from it so that I can state that I am in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JONAS] which is now pending before the committee. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts and also want to say I appreciate his yielding to me the time allotted to him.

We know, Mr. Chairman, from all of our studies of health statistics gathered by the Public Health Service and other independent agencies, that our shortage of hospital beds has accumulated over a period of about 20 years up to this time, and we know also that our Nation continues to increase in population, especially in the last few years. We know from all of the studies that have been made, both by public-health groups and by independent agencies, that our total hospital plant today is still quite inadequate. The gentleman from Illinois gave figures to prove it. I shall not review any of those figures, but I merely want to repeat that as a result of a study which has extended for nearly a year now—a special study of the health needs of the people of the United States of America, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I believe, has come to the conclusion that it is the No. 1 domestic problem facing the United States today. The question of adequate medical and hospital facilities, adequately distributed so that services may be provided at a cost that the people can afford to pay, I submit that is one of the top economic and social problems facing the country.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. We must bear in mind that even in America today there are at least 5 million American families that have a total family income per year of \$1,000 or less and that there are approximately 18 million or 19 million American families comprising about 90 million of our population whose total family income is \$3,500 a year or less. This is vitally important. This and other related matters are vitally important in meeting the challenges that exist within America.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank the gentleman. What he has said is very significant.

Mr. Chairman, just one word further. This hospital survey and construction act in its administration has, in my opinion, and I believe the records will justify that opinion, been one of the most successful of all our Federal-State cooperative programs over the years. The State authorities have in most instances exercised great wisdom in the development of their State plans. There has been the very closest cooperation between those State authorities once their plan has been developed, submitted to the Surgeon General and approved, and all of the program has gone forward.

There has been a smoothly operating cooperative program between the States and the Federal Government, and this \$10 million is needed. I hope the amendment will be approved.

(Mr. PRIEST asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] is recognized.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I would like to supplement what the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] said by recalling to those who are present that in recommending

the extension of the Hospital Extension Act the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce submitted a unanimous report and the bill passed on this floor unanimously.

This program has been one which I have watched with a great deal of interest. It has bipartisan support now and has enjoyed such support in the Congress and throughout the country since its inception. This is gratifying to me, and I join with my fellow Members of this House from both sides of the aisle in supporting this program.

In matters of providing for adequate health and hospital facilities to alleviate a steady increasing need we must be alert to factors permitting such an increase. Once determined, we must seek to control them.

The Hospital Survey and Construction Act provides for a State plan in each State. This State plan in reality is a documentation of the hospital resources in existence and an estimate of the need for such resources.

A statement is also made in the State plan of the method which the State will utilize in meeting the need through the construction of hospital and health facilities. The State plans are developed in the States with the assistance of the State advisory councils for hospital planning and construction. This is an orderly way of approaching the problem.

A review of all the State plans indicates that there is a need in every State for additional hospital construction in the general, tuberculosis, mental, and especially the chronic-disease categories. In every State the State authorities have projects which could go forward if Federal funds were available to match the funds available in the communities seeking assistance. These communities are unable to build their hospitals without the appropriate share of Federal funds. The magnitude of the Federal funds being sought by the communities throughout our country is such that every dollar of the \$75 million of this appropriation will be obligated in the time provided by the basic act. This has been true since the inception of this program. In fact, it is remarkable that less than \$900,000 has been returned to the Treasury out of the over \$600 million appropriated since fiscal year 1948.

There is a reason why these facts are existent. To me that reason is self-evident. It is simply that the people of the Nation want help to do a job in an area they cannot do with their own community resources. The hospital survey and construction program is building about one-third of all hospital construction in the Nation. It has stimulated construction without Federal aid. This is good. It is to be encouraged where possible. However, where Federal aid is needed and wanted. Public Law 725, 79th Congress, as amended, provides for that aid.

Every hospital facility built which is properly designed and then properly administered, serves the people of the community and serves the people of this Nation. Its total work in our total economy is measurable in dollars and also in service to all of us.

The President has reviewed this program. He proposes to broaden it as outlined in his health message. He has requested \$75 million for the currently authorized program. I urge that we support the additional \$10 million and provide the \$75 million requested by the President. This is an opportune time for those who want to support an essential part of the President's program to do so.

I shall now include a statement showing a comparative distribution of funds based on \$65 million and \$75 million:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE, BUREAU OF MEDICAL SERVICES, DIVISION OF HOSPITAL FACILITIES

Comparative distribution of funds to States and Territories for hospital construction for fiscal year 1955 based on \$75 million and \$65 million

State	Allocation		Difference
	\$75,000,000	\$65,000,000	
Alabama.....	\$2,677,734	\$2,315,357	\$362,377
Arizona.....	495,535	428,474	67,061
Arkansas.....	1,611,213	1,393,169	218,044
California.....	3,227,864	2,791,039	436,825
Colorado.....	642,266	555,348	86,918
Connecticut.....	556,536	481,220	75,316
Delaware.....	200,000	200,000	-----
District of Columbia.....	200,000	200,000	-----
Florida.....	1,962,624	1,697,023	265,601
Georgia.....	2,730,542	2,361,019	369,523
Idaho.....	324,745	280,798	43,947
Illinois.....	2,398,572	2,073,974	324,598
Indiana.....	1,765,095	1,526,226	238,869
Iowa.....	1,187,406	1,026,715	160,691
Kansas.....	1,008,424	871,954	136,470
Kentucky.....	2,312,917	1,999,911	313,006
Louisiana.....	2,045,225	1,768,446	276,779
Maine.....	534,266	461,964	72,302
Maryland.....	957,924	828,289	129,635
Massachusetts.....	1,721,001	1,488,099	232,902
Michigan.....	2,466,128	2,132,388	333,740
Minnesota.....	1,512,226	1,307,577	204,649
Mississippi.....	2,112,260	1,826,409	285,851
Missouri.....	1,885,012	1,629,915	255,097
Montana.....	228,439	200,000	28,439
Nebraska.....	610,536	527,913	82,623
Nevada.....	200,000	200,000	-----
New Hampshire.....	272,980	236,038	36,942
New Jersey.....	1,493,828	1,291,669	202,159
New Mexico.....	469,317	405,804	63,513
New York.....	3,345,920	2,893,118	452,802
North Carolina.....	3,321,117	2,871,672	449,445
North Dakota.....	321,691	278,157	43,534
Ohio.....	2,963,822	2,562,730	401,092
Oklahoma.....	1,475,431	1,275,762	199,669
Oregon.....	644,128	556,958	87,170
Pennsylvania.....	4,181,319	3,615,464	565,855
Rhode Island.....	311,934	269,720	42,214
South Carolina.....	1,864,828	1,612,462	252,366
South Dakota.....	330,108	285,435	44,673
Tennessee.....	2,546,569	2,201,943	344,626
Texas.....	4,477,016	3,871,144	605,872
Utah.....	399,750	345,652	54,098
Vermont.....	221,214	200,000	21,214
Virginia.....	2,232,848	1,930,677	302,171
Washington.....	859,830	743,470	116,360
West Virginia.....	1,328,849	1,149,017	179,832
Wisconsin.....	1,514,311	1,309,380	204,931
Wyoming.....	200,000	200,000	-----
Alaska.....	200,000	200,000	-----
Hawaii.....	227,620	200,000	27,620
Puerto Rico.....	2,197,543	1,900,150	297,393
Virgin Islands.....	23,537	20,351	3,186
Total.....	75,000,000	65,000,000	10,000,000

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY] is recognized.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me be allotted to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] is recognized.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY], my distinguished colleague, a member of our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, for the additional time. I am glad to yield to my friend.

Mr. THORNBERRY. I thank you. I am glad to yield to you for the outstanding work you have done in helping pattern legislation which has come out of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the implementation and improvement of this fine hospital construction program.

I am for the amendment. As our colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] pointed out, this has been a bipartisan program; it is not a partisan issue. We should support the recommendation of the President to make this program a workable one and to provide greatly needed hospital facilities throughout the country.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I hope the gentleman's amendment will be accepted overwhelmingly. It seems strange to me that when we are spending so many dollars around the world and then present a proposition that represents something for our own country we always knock out a few million dollars.

It seems to me it is shortsighted for the Federal Government not to be able to fully implement this program which has proved itself so workable in the best spirit of cooperation between the Federal Government and the State and local governments and private organizations.

I am confident the gentleman's amendment will be adopted. If it is not adopted here, it will be over in the Senate and once more the House will get the blame for having kicked something in the teeth that everybody in the country is in favor of. I hope we vote for the amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank my colleague for the very fine statement he has just given to the Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I am supporting the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JONAS].

I wish it were possible to impress upon the minds of the Committee and the Members of this House the importance of this program. I wonder if I could not undertake to give you just a very brief background sketch of this program in order to show you why I think it is very important that this amendment be adopted and why I think this committee should accept it.

The hospital-construction program, commonly known as the Hill-Burton Act, was authorized in 1946. Seventy-five million dollars was authorized at that time. It was recognized that there was a terrific shortage of hospital beds throughout the country; in fact it was recognized so forcibly that in 1949 the Congress increased the authorization to \$150 million annually. The first year of the expanded program the Bureau of the Budget, as I recall, recommended the

full \$150 million for that year. The Korean war came on, and because of the economic situation and the cost of the war the President recommended and took action reducing the program to \$75 million. Since then the program has been gaged to and the plans have been made for an annual appropriation of \$75 million.

A year ago the committee and this House at first provided only \$50 million for this fiscal year. We had a rollcall and only 6 votes prevented the amount from being increased to the \$75 million. It went to the other body which did increase it, and in the conference there was an agreement on \$65 million for this year.

Listen to me, my colleagues. The Bureau of the Budget and the President of the United States recognizing the importance of this program comes back this year and recommends a budget of \$75 million. That is the President's program, and I say to my distinguished friend, the able chairman of this committee and to the other Members who would follow and support their President, that this is what the President is asking for. I am somewhat surprised to find this amendment not acceptable. I understand that perhaps the reason—it is the only reason I can think of—that the committee limited it to \$65 million this year is because it was the amount allowed a year ago for this fiscal year. But that action, Mr. Chairman, had a distracting effect on the hospitalization program for this year. Plans were interfered with because, as I say, since 1950 plans throughout the United States have been made for an annual appropriation of \$75 million.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman, our able chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, who is so familiar with this program and the importance of it and who has given months and months, yes years, of study to this problem.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I want to endorse everything the gentleman from Arkansas has so well said. Anyone who has made the study of this problem that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has made could not help but be in accord with what the gentleman is speaking in behalf of, an increase of this amount to \$75 million. It is inconceivable to me that under the program as it has been established by this House any committee of the House should be unwilling to go along with the recommendation of the President in this matter. I feel greatly indebted to the gentleman from Arkansas for the splendid argument he is making in behalf of this amendment.

HOSPITAL SURVEY AND CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

It is indeed a pleasure and a privilege for me to rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JONAS]. As chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I have had a very close association with the hospital survey and construction program. Last

year this committee unanimously supported an extension of the term of the program through fiscal year 1957, and, if I recall correctly, not one dissenting vote was cast in the House against an extension of the program.

Since last fall my committee has been conscientiously and diligently holding hearings and studying problems relating to the health needs of our Nation. In doing so, the committee spent several weeks on this program and on the recommendations made by the President to broaden and expand the program. The committee unanimously reported a bill which supported the President's recommendations. On March 9, this body without a dissenting vote, approved H. R. 8149 embodying the President's recommendations. The Congress, in my opinion, therefore, has made it outstandingly clear time and time again that this is indeed a most worthwhile program.

There is not a single State or Territory which has not derived great benefit from the program. The statistics have been recited earlier by other Members of this body. I should merely like to remind the Members of the great good that has in the past and will in the future accrue from a program such as this which provides hospital services to great segments of our population that heretofore were deprived of adequate hospital service. Who among us can measure in terms of dollars and cents the value of these fine and functionally modern hospital and medical facilities that are being made available throughout the width and breadth of our land. Can we overlook the significant fact that these hospitals afford an appropriate place for the physician and other health workers to practice their arts and skills in helping humanity.

In providing almost 2,300 hospital and related health facilities, emphasis has also been placed upon the necessity for constructing the type of hospital to train essential medical, nursing, and technical personnel. The limited time available for the discussion of this subject at this time makes it inappropriate to dwell extensively on the critical needs of our Nation for such adequate personnel. At an appropriate time I would be pleased to do so. The committee, of which I am chairman, has heard a great deal of testimony on personnel shortages. Certainly this program is doing its share in helping to meet those needs by providing training facilities.

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee fully explored the hospital bed situation in the United States. Figures on the bed shortages among the various categories of hospitals were furnished. These impressive figures have been referred to earlier by my colleagues. There can be no question of the need for additional hospital beds. There can be no question that the rapid increase in our population and the rate of depreciation and obsolescence of our existing hospitals are two major factors which prevent making any appreciable inroad toward reducing the accumulated hospital bed deficit.

In providing for an orderly survey and appraisal of existing hospital and public health center resources the program is

unique. Funds are not expended haphazardly without requiring sound and basic planning by the States. The degree of States' rights that are preserved by this program is also of interest to the Members. This program, embodying the concepts expounded by the late Senator Taft, is remarkable in the way Federal and State responsibilities have been delicately balanced. It is, indeed, a credit to the Public Health Service and to all of the States that this program has been administered in such an exemplary manner that it has received such unusual acceptance throughout our Nation.

The funds provided in this bill are not for the construction of Federal hospital beds. These funds are used exclusively for the construction of local community hospitals and related health facilities for civilian use. There is a direct prohibition in the basic law against Federal operation or Federal interference in the operation of any of these community facilities. Testimony before our committee indicated that many persons regard this program as effective insurance against socialized medicine. It has certainly been a factor in the continued development of Blue Cross and other voluntary prepayment health-insurance programs.

The President has recommended an appropriation of \$75 million for fiscal year 1955. This is one-half of the amount authorized by the basic law. It would have been pleasing to me if a larger sum had been recommended by the President, but I do not question the wisdom of the President in not recommending the full amount authorized. Certainly it is essential these days to balance the need for a program as worthwhile as this one against the need for other worthwhile programs involving the expenditure of Federal funds. In my opinion, however, we should support the President and vote for an appropriation of \$75 million. To do otherwise is to deny the existence of a pressing need that should and must be met.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman for his statement. Let me tell you just what has been done to date.

GRANTS FOR HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION

The hospital survey and construction program has operated as a cooperative endeavor of local community, State, and Federal Government to bring about more adequate hospital and health facilities in our Nation. It has been in operation since 1946. The first project was completed in 1948. Altogether over 2,200 projects have been approved which will add over 100,000 beds. About 1,500 projects furnishing 60,000 beds have been completed and are serving our people.

The program is currently one of \$1.8 billion. Of this amount the Federal funds amount to \$607.5 million; the local community funds are over \$1.2 billion. This is ample evidence of the reception which the people of the local community have given to this cooperative relationship. They believe in this program and want it continued.

There is a great hospital bed deficit existent today. It is in excess of 750,000 beds in all categories of hospitals. Such

a bed deficit is a result of an accumulation brought about by the 10 years of economic depression in the 1930's and 6 years of World War II. Money was not available in the depression years for hospital construction. In the war years the materials needed in hospital construction were more urgently needed for guns, tanks, bombers, and other war machinery. It was essential that the war be prosecuted to a successful ending. But in 1946, we were faced with a bed shortage of nearly a million hospital beds. So, the hospital survey and construction—Hill-Burton—program was inaugurated and has done great things in bulwarking our country's health defenses.

However, we do have a population increase of about 2,500,000 or better each year, and hospitals, like all other buildings, do become old and require replacing.

It has been found that the provision of Federal funds does provide incentive for hospital construction without Federal aid. However, we still must keep up and not permit a greater bed deficit to accumulate. This means adequate appropriations for the hospital survey and construction program so that it can continue to play its proper role in providing and stimulating hospital construction which is so urgently needed.

Any appropriation less than \$75 million means we will not even keep up with the annual bed need due to the population increase and attrition through obsolescence. It means we will increase our now too great accumulated bed deficit. This we just cannot afford to do if we are to maintain our Nation's health.

I urge that the Members of this House support an additional \$10 million to the \$65 million reported by the Appropriations Committee.

I strongly urge and support these additions for this program of building up our country's health resources.

There has been mention made of the policy established by the Public Health Service in carrying out this program and the progress made speaks for itself. That has been clearly indicated in this debate. I did want to clear up one point, and that has to do with the so-called split-project policy. This came up in the debate some time ago with the expansion of the hospital construction program. In order to clearly understand just what the Department has done regarding these projects let me explain the Department's policy that became effective November 6, 1953, and which is currently in effect.

SPLIT PROJECT POLICY

The following policy is established for programing and approving split projects:

First. Programing:

A. State agencies may not project into future fiscal years on split projects amounts in excess of those derived by application of the following formulae:

1. First succeeding fiscal year: Two-thirds of the current fiscal year allotment to the State or \$200,000, whichever is greater.

2. Second succeeding fiscal year: One-third of the current fiscal year allotment

to the State or \$200,000, whichever is greater.

3. A project may not be split beyond the second succeeding fiscal year or beyond fiscal year 1957, whichever is earlier.

4. There are no restrictions on the commitment to split projects of funds currently available to a State.

B. Any project construction schedule which includes one or more split projects must be forwarded to the Washington office for review prior to approval. The schedule must show not only the commitment of available funds but also the amounts tentatively scheduled out of future fiscal years.

Second. Approving the application: In order to be approvable, an application for a split project must show, in addition to the requirements as specified in part 24-5 of the Health Grants Manual, the following:

A. The applicant must show financial resources equal to the applicant's share of the total cost of constructing and equipping the entire facility. In addition, the applicant must demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Surgeon General the financial means by which the project will be completed in the event of failure of, or reduction in, future Federal appropriations. For example, if the applicant's share of the cost is \$500,000 and the Federal share is \$500,000, but only \$400,000 of the latter is available at the time the application is submitted for approval, the project may be approved as a split project only if the applicant can show that he has \$500,000 available to pay his share, and also that he has the means of providing an additional \$100,000 if necessary. A statement from a bank or other lending agency, discounted pledges in the proper amount, a statement from the proper authority in the case of a publicly sponsored project that the additional funds will be made available, and the like, may be accepted as evidence that the applicant is able to provide the additional funds. If the applicant cannot demonstrate such financial ability, the scope of the project must be reduced to the point where it can be completed with the funds available under which circumstances it becomes a fractional rather than a split project.

B. At the time part 4 of the application for a split project is approved, the applicant must sign the following certification which must be made a part of the application documents:

The applicant understands that approval of this application is a commitment on the part of the Surgeon General for that portion of the Federal funds available to the State for obligation during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955 only; that the Federal Government is not committed to appropriate funds in future fiscal years for this project; and that the eligibility of this project to a share of such Federal funds as may be appropriated in the future is subject to the priority rights of other applicants in the State.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I am sure that the gentleman agrees with me that we

should not labor under a misapprehension here. The fact that the Government is contributing \$75 million annually does not mean that the States are not contributing anything. They have to match these Federal funds, and the States are doing everything to cooperate in this program.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is correct. The Federal Government has contributed a little over \$600 million to this program already, but the local people throughout the country have contributed over one and a quarter billions during the same period of time. I think it is really important that the pending amendment be adopted, and I hope the committee will agree to it.

(Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

GRANTS FOR HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support my colleagues and the President in favor of an outstanding program in government. The Hill-Burton program has demonstrated the effectiveness of an intelligent and orderly approach to a health problem. A survey and appraisal of existing facilities is essential on the part of each State before Federal funds are made available. The States determine their needs. The States determine where and how to spend the Federal money. Such a degree of State responsibility is quite unusual and it is with pride I believe that we can point to a program which has so effectively preserved States rights.

I shall not refer to the dollars spent, to the number of projects constructed, or to the number of hospital beds being provided—I prefer for a moment to consider the hospital services in modern and efficient facilities being furnished to countless tens of thousands who were denied the privilege of such care prior to the advent of this program. Similarly, I refer to the thousands of others who had some kind of mediocre and minimal hospital service available to them but now because of this program have the finest in medical care and hospital services. A magazine writer once described it as a program which should be written in neon lights across the country. I think he was right.

I understand that recent reports by the States reveal they could utilize more than \$250 million in Federal money next year for hospital projects that are ready and able to get under construction during the next fiscal year. The need is so great that it would indeed be a simple matter to justify an appropriation of the full \$150 million authorized by the Hospital Survey and Construction Act but the administration is committed to reducing expenditures in Government and even the most worthwhile program's must take a back seat while we as a Nation fulfill other commitments and keep up our armed strength. For those reasons the President has requested only \$75 million.

While I speak about preparedness and armed strength need, I remind the Members of the value of a network of community hospitals throughout the country in the event of an enemy at-

tack or other catastrophe. I refer specifically to the hundreds of hospitals built under this program in the smaller communities, particularly in those communities of less than 5,000 population. These hospitals could act as evacuation destinations of the target center.

No one can deny the worthwhile nature of this Hill-Burton program and when the President recommends that we increase the amount of the appropriation over what it was last year should any of us question the wisdom of that recommendation? I join my colleagues in urging the appropriation of the full amount recommended by the President.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JONAS].

(On request of Mr. JONAS of Illinois, and by unanimous consent, the time granted him was given to Mr. SPRINGER.)

(Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(Mr. NEAL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

[Mr. NEAL addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I recall very distinctly at the time we had hearings on this matter before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee that there were present the Secretary for Health, Education, and Welfare, Mrs. Hobby, and also the Under Secretary, Mr. Nelson Rockefeller. I asked them at that time and it will show in the record of the hearings when they were before the committee—that they felt it was necessary to have the full appropriation which had been requested by the President of the United States, namely \$75 million this year. They said that sum was absolutely necessary if the needs of hospital construction were to be met for the coming year. I think the evidence in those hearings was quite clear as to the progress that we have been making over the past years in this program, and that this \$75 million was about the minimum to get the job done.

Now, may I say to my colleagues, do not be under any misapprehension that the Hill-Burton Act is curing all of the problems of the hospitals in America. Actually, only about 40 percent of the hospitals are financed under this program. Fully 60 percent are financed by public bodies, such as States, counties, cities, or villages under a bond issue. But, it seems to me that this program does have merit and that the President's recommendation in this case certainly is entitled to every consideration, and I personally do support this amendment and hope the House will adopt it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, there is great appeal for greater appropriations for health and hospital construction. There is no member on this committee who yields to any other person in America in his desire to take good and proper care of the sick people of our

Nation. But, the members of the Committee on Appropriations have a great responsibility, along with the rest of the Members of this House, especially do the members of the Committee on Appropriations, in seeing to it that we do not spend the taxpayers dollars unnecessarily. Of course, I imagine my remarks will be like a voice crying in the wilderness. We must remember that local, State, and Federal taxes are today taking over \$90 billion out of the pockets of the American people. We are spending over \$40 billion annually for national defense, and unless I am badly mistaken there will be a supplemental bill brought to Congress before this session is over for more money for national defense.

Now, it is the popular thing, of course, to be for this amendment, but should our national income go down materially and hence the percentage of the income we take from the pockets of the American people goes up and up and up, the day may soon come when even a little money for such worthy things as is provided for in this bill will be hard to find.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I say again that, of course, it is not popular for a Member of Congress to oppose an amendment of this nature but after all we have a responsibility to discharge as guardians of our United States Treasury, along with our other responsibilities to all our people.

(Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to yield the balance of the time allotted him to Mr. BUSBEY.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I am in full support of the amendment to increase the hospital construction fund from \$65 million to \$75 million. I would like to refer to the remarks of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] when he said that he—a Member on the other side of the aisle—supported the President's program and I suggest that all of us should support the President's program, and I am happy to be in that position at this moment.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. PELLY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I wish to call attention to the remarks made by the distinguished gentleman who is a member of the committee [Mr. JENSEN] that we should be apprehensive about appropriating \$10 million more because the economy of the country might be put in grave danger, if we did. He failed to mention, however, that during the time that this program has been in effect his own State profited in 49 different projects under this program. So apparently when it comes to the State of Iowa, there may not be so much merit to the argument about this increase disturbing the economy of the country. I wanted to make that clear for the record.

Mr. PELLY. I should like to say that I am always glad to be counted with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] on economy measures and I commend him for his position. But in this instance I cannot go along with him because in my

own district in Seattle, I have seen the new Children's Orthopedic Hospital, the Ballard Hospital, the King County Hospital help meet our deficiencies in hospital beds under this program. I have seen the benefits of the program on the local level. I have seen in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the figures given to us by the Department of Health, Welfare, and Education. I know that the need for those beds exists.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. I wish to go along with the gentleman in support of his amendment. As a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I would like to say that we have had testimony concerning the need for this. I think the amendment should be approved.

Mr. PELLY. I would like to say it has been my pleasure to serve with the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and, with him have seen the figures that were given us concerning the need for hospital beds; and also heard testimony as to the need of expanding the so-called Hill-Burton Act this year. I hope that every member of this committee in considering his vote on this amendment will think back to his own local situations and the need for hospital beds in his district. These funds will be used on the State level as matching funds to help relieve this bad situation that we have in the country. I urge every member to support this amendment to increase the hospital fund and not wait for the Senate to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE] for 4 minutes.

(Mr. BUDGE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us now is probably the most difficult bill on which any member of the Appropriations Committee is called upon to work. There are few items in this bill that do not represent a meritorious program. The things in it are programs in which there is general agreement. The committee has honestly and sincerely attempted to allocate all of the funds which it felt could reasonably be used. By the same token I am satisfied that the sponsor of this amendment and the other Members of the House are not interested in appropriating more funds than can be expended.

I call the committee's attention to the figures which were furnished the committee by the Department and which appear on page 713 of the hearings. These are not the committee's figures; these are the figures which were furnished to the committee by the Department:

Estimate of unobligated balances as of June 30, 1954, under appropriation "Grants for hospital construction, Public Health Service": Out of 1953 funds, \$196,809.

Those funds cannot be expended because the appropriation lapses. However, the 1954 funds will be available to

the Department for this purpose, and the Department says it will have "an unobligated balance as of June 30, 1954, of \$30 million" in this appropriation.

Let us see how much the Department has been able to obligate in the past 2 years. In the year 1953 the Department obligated a little under \$60 million. As of the 1st of January it had obligated a little under \$25 million. In other words, in half of the fiscal year 1954 the Department was able to obligate less than \$25 million.

I think those two statements which were furnished us by the Department very conclusively show that the committee's action here provides substantially more funds than the Department will be able to obligate for this purpose. I see no reason why the House should go along in appropriating funds when under its own figures the Department cannot reasonably expect to obligate for the purpose.

The budget originally submitted to us was \$50 million, the same figure which the House approved last year. From the obligations as of this time, it appears that the House figure of \$50 million last year was amply sufficient. Certainly the figure included in this bill of \$65 million is sufficient.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] to close debate on the amendment.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to clear up a few things before I get into some technical aspects of the situation.

Reference has been made several times to the President's recommendation, but the Members failed to state which recommendation: the first recommendation of \$50 million or the second recommendation of \$75 million.

Why were there two recommendations? The reason is simple, and it has not been touched upon in debate today. The House passed legislation—which is now pending in the Senate and is expected to be passed by that body very shortly—authorizing an appropriation of \$60 million for different types of chronic-disease hospitals and nursing homes, plus \$2,500,000 for the planning and survey of these institutions. That, plus the \$50 million first recommended for the existing program, made \$112,500,000 for hospital construction this year. Then they learned that the bill authorizing this new program would be delayed a few months. They thought they could not possibly use the \$60 million in the first year it was authorized, so they decided they had better take \$25 million of that \$60 million and add it to the general hospital-construction bill. So, in reality, instead of cutting this bill \$10 million, as has been charged on the floor of the House today, the subcommittee actually recommended an increase of \$15 million on the basis of the first recommendation of the President.

I concur and agree with all the emotional and humanitarian things that have been said here on the floor of the House today about the need for hospital beds; but I also want to be practical.

Partially as a result of the debate last year on this particular item—and I do

not say this with any egotism, nor for the purpose of getting credit—after the Congress adjourned last year, I spent several months visiting many States to look personally not only at the hospitals and the hospital-construction program under this appropriation, but many of the other programs with which this subcommittee has to deal. First of all, I came to the conclusion that we are building hospital beds faster than we are taking care of staffing them with nurses and doctors. I think this particular division of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare could very well emphasize and pay more attention to the shortage of nurses which exists in almost every hospital in the United States. I wish I had an hour to talk about that particular factor alone. If we had the nurses and the doctors to staff these hospitals, I would be one who would want to expand this program and even to appropriate more than \$75 million, if the need existed.

We have never explored this program more thoroughly than we have this year in the hearings, but, even then, not as much as we should have because of the lack of time. If you will look at the hearings, you will find there are over 200 pages of testimony on this one item alone. I wish to call your attention, first of all, to page 615, where I read into the record an article from the Kansas City Times by a man who was working in this field in which he stated that they are building hospitals too fast in Kansas. I will read that portion of the hearings record:

Mr. BUSBEY. The reason why I selected Kansas was because an article from the Kansas City Times of April 13, 1954, was brought to my attention. This article is headed "Too Fast on Hospitals—Some Kansas Centers May Have to Close." The article reads: "Basing his conclusions on bed-occupancy records, C. C. Lamley tells KU group of over-expansion in State."

I take it that must be the Kansas University group.

"Kansas now has too many hospitals from the viewpoint of use and economic operation, Carl C. Lamley told a postgraduate assembly of 170 anesthesiologists yesterday afternoon at the University of Kansas Medical Center.

"Lamley, director of the Stormont-Vail Hospital, Topeka, based his conclusions on bed-occupancy records.

"'Kansas has built 58 hospitals and 28 additions to others in the last 6 years,' Lamley said. It now has 123 hospitals with 7,000 beds, an increase of 3,100 beds in 6 years.

"'The State has 4 beds for each 1,000 population, whereas the expert view is that 2½ beds per 1,000 for rural areas is correct,' Lamley added.

"'As a result,' he went on, 'the number of unoccupied beds has zoomed from an average of 1,200 4 years ago to almost 2,500 now.' This doubling of vacant beds is due partly, Lamley added, to community pride in building hospitals.

"This pride, pardonable and understandable because it reflects desire to create a good workshop for keeping doctors in rural areas, has overridden caution on Federal aid for hospital building, in Lamley's opinion.

"'The bed vacancies have hit the small hospitals hardest,' Lamley said. Occupancy in Kansas hospitals with 10 to 25 beds has dropped to 45 percent, and in hospitals with 25 to 50 beds, to 52 percent. But occupancy in hospitals with 100 beds and over is averaging 73 percent, enough for economic operation.

"'It is almost impossible,' Lamley said, 'to operate a hospital with fewer than 50 beds by modern standards of care and cost, without deficits.

"'Most hospitals operate on a shoestring, capitalwise, and it appears likely some of the half-occupied ones in Kansas will have to close soon.'

"If some hospitals close, Lamley added, it won't mean necessarily that they will not be used. He predicted some would be converted to places for chronic illnesses and convalescent care. Some would be taken over by religious groups, some by trade-union organizations wishing to offer package medical care to their members.

"The anesthesiologist, as a private-practitioner in his specialty, might not like these trends, Lamley added.

"Virtually all hospitals will be clamoring for Government subsidy, particularly of their nursing schools and educational programs, he predicted."

Then, if you will turn to page 624, you will find my comments concerning the situation I found at Louisa, Va. They had built a maternity hospital there to take care of maternity cases. But they had very few maternity cases for that hospital. Here is what they did. They remodeled the building in order to provide offices for four doctors. They also provided an office for a dentist. They even provided an office for the Selective Service Board. All that was done in order to secure income to keep the hospital from closing because of lack of finances.

Then I wish you would turn to page 641, and read about the situation at Indianapolis. I pay my respects to the State of Indiana for their viewpoint on these Federal-aid programs, and particularly to the people of Indianapolis. While we were contributing \$1,500,000 of the taxpayers' money for a so-called food service-center building, or, as more correctly called in their brochure, a student-union building—which, in my opinion, the Federal Government had no business participating in at all—the citizens of Indianapolis, with no Federal aid of any kind, voluntarily raised \$12 million for hospital beds in the city of Indianapolis. They did such a wonderful job that I should like to read an article on the subject that appeared in the Sunday Indianapolis Star of May 9, 1954, entitled "Civic Victory":

Without incurring indebtedness, Indianapolis has, all by itself, provided for its medical present.

"Goodness is the only investment that never fails." A great American—naturalist, poet, philosopher, Henry David Thoreau, said that nearly 100 years ago.

"And now, Indianapolis, city of half-a-million people, has taken his statement, tested it, tempered it, proved it, and found it of truest steel.

"Indianapolis has completed one of the largest civic investments in practical good will ever attempted, and its efforts will return a thousandfold in human life and health and happiness—and in civic pride and stature—giving new meaning to the letters chiseled on its own city hall, 'I am * * * a citizen of no mean city.'"

The investment is in hospital space. And now, National Hospital Week (May 9–15) Indianapolis is ready to stand back and watch its dollars grow into brick and steel.

Its only a matter of a few weeks now until the bulldozers will be thrusting aside forever the trash piles in the weed-grown acres at Ritter Avenue and 16th Street where will rise the new \$5,050,000 Community Hospital

with its complete facilities, 300 beds, and room for 2 more units of 300 each when they're needed. It is to be ready for use by July 1956.

On April 21 St. Francis Hospital, Beech Grove, broke ground for a 104-bed wing and new facilities; within 2 years, Methodist Hospital, the largest in the Nation of its denomination, will build a 6-story 224-bed wing, and double the size of its nurses' residence.

An ugly, green frame, gingerbreaded relic of a former residential elegance within 2 years will be razed to be replaced with a new 100-bed psychiatric institute—Norways Foundation Hospital.

All to the tune of \$12 million, freely given and to be freely spent in Indianapolis. All subscribed, willingly and heartily by an understanding citizenry within a 14-month period—no taxes, no bonds, no outside aid, no burden of debt. Indianapolis architects have made all the designs, and Indianapolis builders and workmen will be used.

Realization that Indianapolis was woefully short of hospital beds didn't exactly burst suddenly upon a surprised populace. But the shortage grew rapidly to alarming proportions commensurate with the city's feverish industrial mushrooming during World War II. Everybody knew it but could do nothing about it until the second A-bomb fell in Nagasaki.

By that time there was a waiting list of 1,000 patients virtually beating upon hospital doors for admittance, putting off operations, taking chances, getting along somehow, or dying quietly at home.

The city's excess population over available hospital beds was like South Bend without a single institutional cot. An epidemic would have inscribed a Hoosier scar on history.

Aware and trembling over what could happen was the medical profession, the Red Cross, and civil-defense authorities. Those of us on the patient level only knew that mothers were going home 1 day after childbirth, that 3 days was a long stay for appendectomy, and we were grumbling if we had to occupy a cot in a busy hospital hall; surgery often was delayed 6 weeks.

The Marion County Medical Association appointed a ways and means committee. All kinds of suggestions were considered. A city bond issue, a county bond issue, a joint city-county bond issue, an appeal for emergency Federal hospital funds. Estimates would have to be made, land would have to be sought. All that was known for certain was a grievous need. And out of that need a vision was born.

Business and industrial leaders were called in, consulted, and made members of the team, along with civic-minded citizens, legislators, workers, unions, professions, locking arms instead of horns, all inspired with a realization that this was a matter of "not who's right but what's right" a belief in the "rightness of things" and the "quickest way is the best way."

A permanent committee was formed on the new concept of participation. Using preliminary money grants from the medical society and the Eli Lilly Foundation a firm of professional hospital experts was employed to conduct a 9-week survey in April 1951, at a cost of \$25,000 to "get something on paper" to see what actually was needed, in such a form that it could be proved to the city.

As foreseen, the survey reported, "An acute shortage of hospital space exists that cannot be exaggerated." It recommended 1,327 more hospital beds and \$19,450,000 in new hospital construction. It was decided that \$12 million would be raised by popular subscription for the more immediate phases, and an additional \$7 million would come later by taxation for Indiana University Medical Center expansion, for Indianapolis

General Hospital, and by private subscription for St. Vincent's Hospital.

The teeming, rapidly expanding east side, with its multiple industrial construction and housing projects would need a brandnew hospital. Additions to Methodist and St. Francis Hospitals and rebuilding of Norways would suffice to tide over the short-term emergency.

A nonprofit charitable corporation with a 37-member board, Indianapolis Hospital Development Association, Inc., was organized with Edward F. Gailahue, president of the American States Insurance Co., as chairman. The wheels were moving; there was something on paper; the spirit was there; the way ahead was long but the visibility was good. And Indianapolis girt up its loins to attempt the second largest public subscription hospital drive ever attempted by any city. (Detroit took 4 years to raise \$20 million.)

Beautiful, modern, functional buildings began to take shape on architects' drawing boards, and the machinery for this city's race for time against disaster was bolted together. The gifts were to be from the heart—reflecting each individual donor's feeling of responsibility—a metropolitan adoption of the battle cry of the Musketeers: "One for all, and all for one."

The big push is now history. Within 14 months Indianapolis subscribed more than 4 times as much as the community ever had poured out at once for civic or charitable purposes. By the time victory was announced at a big dinner, December 17, 1953, more than 2,300 business enterprises had made pledges averaging nearly \$50 per employee; more than 110,000 individuals had pledged more than \$4,500,000. One hundred foundations and nonprofit philanthropic organizations had subscribed more than \$1 million. There was an oversubscription of more than \$140,000.

The drive had received national recognition in newspaper accounts. President Eisenhower said it was " * * * tribute to excellent organization, rare diligence, and warmly responsive citizenry * * * commendable spirit of self-reliance * * * stirring example to all people everywhere."

And it was a victory for something else too; every hospital, as a result of a suggestion by the mayor's commission on human rights, agreed to accept patients henceforward "without regard to race, color, or creed." To the large Negro population the answer was a definite "Yes."

Of the more than \$12 million in pledges, more than \$7 million already has been collected in cash. Of this, \$6,500,000 has been invested in interest-bearing Government bonds until actual building starts. Campaign expenses were unusually low (2.1 percent), \$250,000.

During Hospital Week a short reactivation drive will be conducted to pick up loose ends, to bring into the total plan many who had no opportunity to subscribe originally—such as new residents in the city, companies unable to conduct campaigns a year ago, individual donors who may wish to subscribe to memorials in honor of relatives or friends. Funds subscribed in this short drive will be ample to replace pledges which, for one reason or another, may be uncollectible over the 3-year period for payment of pledges.

With justifiable pride, Indianapolis now is answering how-to-do-it questions which flood in from other communities who are telling themselves, "If Indianapolis can do it, why can't we?"

The reason I took the committee's time to read it is that that article appealed to me as representing the pioneer spirit in this country, the spirit that made this country great and the spirit that is making this country today. It

is a spirit that was not always looking to the Federal Government to do something that the local community could and has the capacity to do for itself.

Down in Louisville, Ky., we participated, under this hospital-construction program, in building an addition to the State health building for engineering and laboratory facilities. Was that building for hospital beds? When they come in here and plead for hospital beds, I am for them, but the reason I am bringing these things before the committee today is because I think, in all sincerity, that this program needs some revision. In my opinion, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should rewrite the regulations, particularly those affecting the so-called related facilities for which they are granting money.

Then, on page 759 of the hearings, let me tell you what I found out at Denmar, W. Va. Before I tell you about Denmar, I should mention that I had the pleasure of sitting in with the State Board of Health of West Virginia when I was in Charleston. I spent 2 days with the board that controls this program in the State of Indiana. Incidentally, speaking of Indianapolis, the board told me the only reason they wanted the so-called food service center to participate in this program was because they did not have any application for construction of regular hospitals that would have added hospital beds. In the State of West Virginia every dime of the taxpayers' money under this program for the first 2 years went into State institutions because they did not have applications for hospital beds.

But to get back to the project at Denmar, W. Va. First of all, the original hospital there was opened in 1939, and the main building consisted of 125 beds. This is a regular tuberculosis hospital for colored people. In my opinion, it was probably one of the worst places a TB hospital could have been located. First of all, it is down in the valley between the mountains, where the fog, dew, or moisture, or whatever technical name might be used, does not rise until about 10 o'clock or 10:30, and it starts to settle very early in the afternoon.

The road going back to this hospital is an ordeal in itself to drive over, and I have driven in every State in the United States.

The closest Negro community is many miles from this hospital, which means that anyone visiting the hospital must leave the Negro settlement at a reasonably early hour in the morning in order to get back to this place.

Denmar, W. Va., consists only of the hospital. That is Denmar. There are no other inhabitants or facilities there of any kind, and in order to get back to the closest Negro settlement at night they have to leave rather early in the afternoon, which means that they cannot have much time with their relatives or friends, whom they went there to visit.

We participated in a project there with Hill-Burton funds to build an addition to this hospital, notwithstanding the fact that the old hospital was not being used to capacity; notwithstanding the

fact that they should have had 12 registered nurses for the old hospital, and only had 3 at the time I visited the institution, and they were losing 1 of the 3 within a couple of days. They should have had 4 doctors, including a superintendent, and they only had a superintendent who was a doctor of medicine, and 3 part-time doctors who spend less than 2 days per month there. Notwithstanding this situation the State Board of Health of West Virginia and their planning division O. K.'d the project for Hill-Burton funds, and evidently the regional office and the Washington office must have approved it also.

When I was in Charleston, W. Va., the State Board of Health of West Virginia was meeting, and I sat in on the board meeting for about 2 hours and discussed a great many questions with them. This new wing had been completed approximately 2 years when I had visited the hospital, and all the equipment that had been bought for this new wing was still in the original crates in which it had been shipped to the hospital and located on the various floors of this wing, without ever having been uncrated, let alone put into use, because there were no demands for the beds to put it in use.

Now, in addition to that, they built two very plush modernistic homes that were supposed to be used for doctors on the grounds. Of course, the only doctor they had was the superintendent.

In addition to that, they built a very plush modernistic nurses' home, what might be described as a ranch-type home, for 21 nurses. They have a private room for each nurse, and while we as a committee or you as a division are not directly interested in maintenance costs, I think it is worth mentioning in passing that while I was there in August they were getting ready to replace the entire roof of this nurses' home.

They had built a radiant heating system into the floors of the nurses' home and they were continually tearing up the floor trying to repair this system. Although it was a brand-new building, the floors were in bad shape, the walls were cracking, which was going to cost money to maintain.

I wish that I had more time to tell you about many other situations that I found where I thought, and I am sure most of you would agree, that these funds were being very unwisely spent. I think we have provided sufficient funds to cover the legitimate needs for 1955.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JONAS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOGARTY) there were—ayes 60, noes 35.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. BUSBEY and Mr. JONAS of Illinois to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 139, noes 56.

So the amendment was agreed to.

(Mr. WOLVERTON and Mr. CANFIELD asked and were given permission to revise and extend their remarks.)

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the very substantial majority action taken on the amendment I think something should be said about a related item connected with this appropriation.

There was ample evidence presented to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on the splendid job of administering this program at Federal level by the Public Health Service. In fact, the program has been described as a model of Federal-State-local cooperation. In singling out this program for broadening legislation, the President, has, himself, recognized its values, merits, and accomplishments.

Last year, after an extensive appropriation cut, \$875,000 was made available for salaries and expenses to carry on its administration at the Federal level. The Appropriations Committee proposes a reduction to \$750,000 for next year, which represents the amount originally requested by the President. However, I understand that the President has now recommended, for salaries and expenses, \$950,000 to go along with the \$75 million for hospital-construction purposes. While the Presidential request has gone to the Senate, it was too late to submit it formally to the House Appropriations Subcommittee. Since the members have voted to support the President's request of \$75 million for construction purposes, I urge that support likewise be given to the President's request of \$950,000 for salaries and expenses.

I hope the committee will consider the vote on construction funds an instruction to them in conference to carry out the full Presidential request for this item, if it is inserted by the other body.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words, and I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

WHOSE OX IS GORED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald appears the headline: "Welch Excoriates McCARTHY as Cruel, Lacking Decency—Senator Grins, Lawyer Cries."

Inside on another page is the picture of the poor, weeping lawyer doing his crying.

It just occurred to me that it makes some difference whose ox is being gored. As I understand it, he was crying because someone had inquired as to whether an attorney who it was suggested be hired by the committee had been affiliated with some organization

which might have been a little to the left. The Lawyers Guild, I think it was.

But when Mr. Welch had his opportunity to exercise forbearance, charity, Christianity, tolerance, and some more good qualities, this is the way it went, when Mr. Cohn was on the stand:

Mr. Welch was very inquisitive. I quote:

Mr. WELCH. In January where did you (Cohn and Schine) go?

Mr. COHN. We had dinner at the—at a hotel, the Drake Hotel, the Drake Room.

Mr. WELCH. January 10?

Mr. COHN. Your sources of information are better than mine.

Mr. WELCH. I even know what you spent. You had \$32.96 worth of dinner and \$5.85 worth of drinks. Does that sound all right?

Mr. COHN. It sounds a little high since I am not going with the girl I had out any more.

Mr. WELCH. How about January 2? Do you want to be reminded how much you spent at the Stork Club?

Mr. COHN. I am trying to think who I was out with first.

Mr. WELCH. Do you know where you were on the night of December 4? May I suggest to you, sir, that you were at the Stork Club on that night and spent \$25.75?

Mr. COHN. Could be. (He said Schine was not there.)

Mr. WELCH. Do you know where Dave was on the night of December 3? That is just the night before.

Mr. COHN. If it were Thursday night and I were with him, we would be working, yes, sir.

Mr. WELCH. You were working. Were you working at the Stacy-Trent Hotel (in Trenton, N. J.)? Did you work your way through \$12.85 worth of dinner?

Mr. COHN. If Mr. Carr (Francis P. Carr, McCarthy's rotund staff director) were along, I would say it is probable.

DINNER FOR \$14.95

Mr. WELCH. On December 1, do you know where you were? Would it surprise you to know that Mr. Schine was at the Stacy-Trent Hotel? Did you eat your way through \$14.95 worth of dinner?"

Mr. COHN. It sounds fine, sure.

Mr. WELCH. Where were you on November 30? There was no pass granted on that night, but the records show that Mr. Schine was at the Stacy-Trent Hotel. Could you eat anything on the fort if you tried?

Mr. COHN. I tried it once, sir.

Mr. WELCH. On the 29th of November, were you with Dave at the Drake Hotel in New York?

Did you eat your way through \$16.48 worth of food at the Drake Hotel, plus \$3.46 for drinks?

Mr. COHN. It could very well be.

Mr. WELCH. On November 28, were you and Mr. Schine at the Stork Club?

Mr. COHN. Mr. Welch, as far as I know, and I am quite sure of this, Mr. Schine was not at the Stork Club at any time while he was stationed at Fort Dix. Period.

Mr. WELCH. On November 13 until November 15, Schine was off at Dix. Was he with you?

Did you go to Sardi's with him?

Mr. COHN. I am sure I did not.

Mr. WELCH. Where was Dave on New Year's Eve?

Mr. COHN. At my house. I think he left around 12:30; something like that.

Mr. WELCH. Were you busily at work until then, Mr. Cohn?

Mr. COHN. I'm afraid we were, sir. Yes.

Mr. WELCH. It seems to me almost above and beyond the call of duty to work so late and so hard.

WORKED ON REPORT

Mr. COHN. We, on New Year's eve, sir, we did work on that particular draft of the annual report which you have before you.

Mr. WELCH. Can you tell us whether or not you know who was with Mr. Schine on New Year's eve?

Mr. COHN. He was at my house. There was a couple, a friend of mine and his wife. There was another friend of mine, a man, Dave Schine. And there was a young lady who is a friend of Dave Schine's, who came up later in the evening. It was about 10.

What has all that to do with the issue that is before that committee? As I understood it, one gentleman was charged with being a little abusive to a soldier. If I had been in his place, I would have said, "Yes; probably I am mistaken about that, and I apologize."

Then I would have asked, What did the Army do about that fellow who claimed immunity under the fifth amendment when he was asked about being a Communist, who kept him in, who promoted him, who gave him an honorable discharge?

But counsel for the Army is trying to find out what Cohn and Schine had to eat and drink. What has that to do with the issue before the committee?

And where was the weeping heartbroken, charitable Mr. Welch hiding his fairness when he was examining Mr. Cohn? How much did it cost the Army to tail Cohn and Schine and measure the food and drinks they purchased with their own money?

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, not only is the oil-producing industry in Oklahoma greatly disturbed, but the State, municipal, county governments, as well as the school districts and every individual are vitally affected by any change in the petroleum picture in our great State.

Our people are opposed to any downward reduction in our depletion allowances from 27½ to 15 percent. The threat of such reduction, plus the increased foreign importations, plus the recent proration reductions curtailing production, have caused Oklahomans to shake with fear. Eventually, the income of every Oklahoma individual will become adversely affected unless something is done immediately.

I have requested Mr. Russell B. Brown, general counsel of the Independent Petroleum Association of America, to furnish me some information on the extent and economic value of the oil industry in Oklahoma, which I wish to give to you now:

The oil producing industry in Oklahoma

EXTENT AND ECONOMIC VALUE OF INDUSTRY

1. Number of counties in State.....	77
2. Number of counties with oil and/or gas production.....	63
3. Total land area of State..... acres.....	44, 179, 840
4. Area proved productive of oil and/or gas..... do.....	1, 300, 000
5. Estimated nonproductive area leased Jan. 1, 1954..... do.....	16, 100, 000
6. Percent of total land area productive or leased.....	39
7. Value at wells of crude oil produced, all time, to Jan. 1, 1954.....	\$10, 353, 562, 000
8. Average field price of crude oil per barrel in 1953.....	\$2.70
9. Value at wells of crude oil produced in 1953.....	\$545, 920, 000
10. Value of natural gas liquids produced in 1953.....	\$47, 470, 000
11. Value at wells of natural gas produced in 1953.....	\$34, 030, 000
12. Total value of crude oil, natural gas liquids and natural gas in 1953.....	\$627, 420, 000
13. Principal mineral products in order of value:	
1st..... Crude petroleum.....	
2d..... Natural gas liquids.....	
3d..... Natural gas.....	
14. Percent petroleum value to total value of all minerals.....	90.3
15. Number of employees engaged in crude oil and natural gas production.....	42, 900

PRODUCTION

16. 1st year of recorded production.....	1891
17. Crude oil produced during first year..... barrels.....	30
18. Year of largest production.....	1927
19. Crude oil produced year of largest production..... barrels.....	277, 775, 000
20. Crude oil produced in 1953..... do.....	202, 570, 000
21. Crude oil produced all time to Jan. 1, 1954..... do.....	6, 840, 152, 000
22. Percent of crude oil produced by stripper wells.....	32
23. Natural gas liquids produced in 1953..... barrels.....	20, 183, 000
24. Natural gas produced in 1953..... million cubic feet.....	618, 700
25. Average production in barrels daily:	

	1950	1951	1952	1953
Crude oil.....	451, 000	512, 000	520, 300	555, 000
Natural gas liquids.....	40, 400	48, 100	50, 900	55, 100
Total petroleum liquids.....	491, 400	560, 100	571, 200	610, 100

(Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, even the most disinterested and uninformed person cannot fail to appreciate what is to be the ultimate and harmful result of this House's action cutting funds for the Food and Drug Administration in the appropriation bill now before us.

The dangers inherent in such a move by this House were graphically and aptly stated by my colleague the gentlewoman from Missouri, the Honorable LEONOR SULLIVAN in remarks delivered yesterday on this floor. Since her arrival in the Congress, Mrs. SULLIVAN has devoted herself diligently and intelligently to the betterment of our pure-food laws. The excellence of her statement yesterday reflects the forthrightness and zeal with which she has approached the problem.

Mr. Chairman, the Food and Drug Administration operated last year under a budget of \$5,200,000—a meager sum at best. Now we know that the plan is to cut that appropriation by \$100,000 for the coming year. Our Food and Drug Administration is the watchful guardian of our Nation's health. Its program merits the thoughtful attention and consideration of every American, whether he sits here in the House of Representatives or the tiniest home in the tiniest hamlet of these United States. Instead, what is to happen? A substantial slash is to be made of the already small payroll on which the Administration seeks to operate.

Back in 1951, I introduced a bill to establish a district office of the Food and Drug Administration in Detroit. At that time, and the passage of the years has only increased the gravity of the situa-

tion—Detroit was the only major port in the United States not being serviced by a pure food and drug laboratory. We still have not received that facility. There is little indication that we are ever to receive it. And yet the import volume through the customs district of Michigan, in 1951, was approximately \$400 million, more than Los Angeles and San Francisco combined. In spite of this, and in spite of the very great increase in import trade through the port of Detroit since 1933, no additional facilities have been made available. Speaking for myself and for the 14th district of Michigan, I know that sending imported food and drug products to Chicago for inspection—and that is where they are sent—sets up an uneconomic trade pattern which works a discriminatory hardship on Detroit area businessmen and importers, consumers and “good-neighbor” Canadian exporters. This sad situation obtains not only in Detroit, but in many other sections of the country. Facilities are inadequate and overworked.

And yet the difficulty does not lie with the Food and Drug Administration. They have done remarkably well on what has been allotted to them. The fault lies in the Congress. And it is a fault which is within our power to remedy.

The Members of this House are, of course, familiar with the fine work done by the Food and Drug Administration in its various research, inspection, and related activities. Equally as familiar, however, but in a way which strikes much closer to home and hearth, are the mothers and breadwinners whose job it is to safeguard the health of their youngsters and families. The smooth func-

tioning of the entire community is utterly dependent upon the efficient and effective operation of the Food and Drug Administration. Our health is our wealth, and we shall be poor indeed soon enough unless we take affirmative steps to strengthen the Food and Drug Administration, rather than to emasculate it as we are doing here today. Bit by bit we seem to be rendering it impotent and ineffective. Surely it deserves better treatment than this.

In the light of the many larger appropriations which come through this House in the course of one session of Congress pertaining to matters of much smaller import, it would seem that we do ourselves and the health of our communities a great disservice in cutting this appropriation at this time.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to make a brief announcement. I am sure none of us wants to prevent anyone from speaking, but there are some situations that do exist, including important conferences with the Senate, which make it necessary to expedite action on the bill that is before us as fast as reasonably possible. I think everyone will appreciate it if the Members will extend their remarks, instead of taking time to speak on matters not related to the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

National Cancer Institute: To enable the Surgeon General, upon the recommendations of the National Advisory Cancer Council, to make grants-in-aid for research and training projects relating to cancer; to cooperate with State health agencies, and other public and private nonprofit institutions, in the prevention, control, and eradication of cancer by providing consultative services, demonstrations, and grants-in-aid, and to otherwise carry out the provisions of title IV, part A, of the act; \$20,237,000.

26. Number of producing oil wells at end of 1953.....	63, 076
27. Average daily production per well at end of 1953..... barrels.....	8.4
28. Percent of wells pumping or other artificial lift, Jan. 1, 1954.....	97

EXPLORATION AND DEVELOPMENT

29. Deepest well drilled to Jan. 1, 1954..... feet.....	17, 823
30. Wells drilled during 1953:	

	Wildcat wells		Development wells		Total wells	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Oil wells.....	121	16.3	4, 475	65.3	4, 596	60.5
Gas wells.....	37	5.0	302	4.4	339	4.5
Dry holes.....	584	78.7	1, 941	28.3	2, 525	33.2
Service wells.....	0	0	133	2.0	133	1.8
Total.....	742	100.0	6, 851	100.0	7, 593	100.0

31. Total footage drilled 1953..... feet.....	26, 122, 000
32. Average depth of wells drilled in 1953..... do.....	3, 440
33. Geophysical and core drilling crews active Jan. 1, 1954.....	35
34. Drilling rigs in use Jan. 1, 1954.....	656

RESERVES

35. New oil fields and pays found in 1953.....	167
36. New crude oil reserves found in 1953..... barrels.....	394, 290, 000
37. New natural gas liquid reserves found in 1953..... do.....	46, 691, 000
38. Total crude and gas liquid reserves found in 1953..... do.....	440, 981, 000
39. Proved crude oil reserves, Jan. 1, 1954..... do.....	1, 752, 228, 000
40. Proved natural gas liquid reserves, Jan. 1, 1954..... do.....	304, 232, 000
41. Total crude and gas liquid reserves, Jan. 1, 1954..... do.....	2, 056, 460, 000
42. New gas fields and pays found in 1953.....	33
43. New natural gas reserves found in 1953..... million cubic feet.....	1, 302, 777
44. Proved reserves of natural gas, Jan. 1, 1954..... do.....	12, 228, 373

GENERAL

45. State gasoline taxes, 1953.....	\$44, 927, 000
46. Rate of State gasoline taxes January 1954..... cents per gallon.....	6½
47. Number of automobiles registered 1953.....	670, 000
48. Number of trucks and buses registered 1953.....	240, 000
49. Number of refineries in State Jan. 1, 1954.....	21
50. Capacity of refineries Jan. 1, 1954..... barrels daily.....	371, 650

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I have four amendments relating to the National Institutes of Health which have the approval of the majority and minority members of the subcommittee. I offer them at this time and ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. BUSBEY:

On page 23, line 17, strike out "\$20,237,000" and insert "\$21,237,000."

Page 23, line 21, strike out "\$12,460,000" and insert "\$13,460,000."

Page 23, line 24, strike out "\$15,168,000" and insert "\$16,168,000."

Page 24, line 13, strike out "\$5,913,000" and insert "\$6,913,000."

Mr. BUSBEY. As chairman of the subcommittee responsible for recommending the appropriations for the National Institutes of Health, I am indeed happy to offer the amendments which will add \$1 million for research in each of the Institutes for heart, cancer, mental health, and neurology and blindness. While it is my honor to offer these amendments, which are being considered en bloc, I desire to have it clearly understood that each member of the subcommittee joins me in offering the amendments and that they are sponsoring them just as much as I am.

I have asked that these four amendments be considered en bloc because they are each for the same general purpose; that is, to increase, by a relatively small amount, the funds available for the research program of the National Institutes of Health. These amendments add \$1 million each to the institutes for heart, cancer, mental health, and neurology, and blindness.

The amount in the bill for the National Institutes is \$2,240,000 above the 1954 appropriation. However, one must bear in mind that the operating expenses of the Institutes will be \$14,112,000 in 1955, as compared to \$11,920,550 in 1954, or an increase of \$2,191,450 in 1955. Most of this increase is due to the further activation of the new clinical center. I feel sure that the Congress intended to provide adequately for the operation of this center when it appropriated \$60 million to build and equip it. I am equally sure that it was not the intent of Congress that the cost of operating the center should be made up by reducing other important activities of the Institutes.

The figures I have just given show that the bill as reported provides just enough money to offset the increase in operating expenses and enough to continue other activities—most important of which is research grants—at the same level as 1954. I have been thinking about this a great deal since the bill was reported, and I have discussed it with my good friend, the ranking minority member on the subcommittee, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. The more I have thought about this the more I have become convinced that this is not the time to maintain the status quo in medical research. We should take full advantage of the basic discoveries of the

last few years on these dread diseases to further our knowledge and to find actual cures and preventatives. I do not believe we can do that by maintaining the status quo in these appropriations. These amendments will provide the means for making further advances, which, I am certain, will be worth far more than the \$4 million involved just in future economic benefits to the Nation, to say nothing of the alleviation of human suffering and misery.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak briefly concerning each of these fields of medical research individually.

THE NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE

Cancer is one of our major killers. It strikes 1 out of every 2 households; every day 600 Americans die of this disease; 25,000 will die of cancer in 1954; and 700,000 will be under treatment during the year, of whom 530,000 will be newly diagnosed. It is impossible to make an accurate estimation of the amount of suffering of the victim and his family.

I am convinced, with the experts, that the problem can only be initially ameliorated and eventually solved through research such as is now being supported by the National Cancer Institute, and I believe this should be expanded. I would not recommend the expenditure of the sums involved in this appropriation, unless I was convinced, on the basis of extensive testimony, that sure progress is being made in this field and wide opportunity continues to exist. I would like to mention a few points concerning the progress already made:

First. An understanding of the beginnings of cancer is emerging—in relation to industry, this has altered practices, with a consequent prevention of disease.

Second. Early detection of cancer in the woman, that is, cancer of the cervix, permits curative operation before invasion. I am told that this is not yet at the stage where one can tell each woman that one serious type of cancer has been conquered, but that would appear to be in the not too distant future.

Third. New chemicals effective in the leukemias of children have been developed—not yet curative but they retard the disease at times for many years.

Fourth. More frequent surgical treatment is now available as a result of research.

Fifth. More effective radiation therapy is now available, and better diagnostic X-ray.

We have come a long way in the past 10 years, and can look hopefully to the future. I am proud to say that many of these advances have been the result of the Congress having put the Federal dollar to work on this great national problem. I am glad to have had a part in this. We must be patient, but we can be hopeful. Specific opportunities pointed up at our hearings include the development of new chemicals to suppress these diseases and the possibility of their use in combination; also the clarification of the role of the endocrines in both the causation and modification of cancer; the testing of more powerful radiation; progressive and more detailed understanding of the basic nature of the disease, an essential for its final conquest.

NEUROLOGY

Neurology is the great disabler. Twenty million people in the United States are affected by a multiplicity of these nerve conditions: cerebral palsy, multiple sclerosis, epilepsy, muscular dystrophy, apoplexy, Parkinson's disease, and injuries to the brain and spinal cord. Also included are the diseases which cause blindness. Essentially there is little research in this area in this country. Also included is the study of deafness. Again, there is very little work being done in this country.

The economic loss is staggering. These diseases do not kill; they cripple. The cost is threefold: Patient care, wage and productivity loss, tax loss. Again, research is the only solution.

It was developed at the hearings that information had been acquired at the Clinical Center which would be of interest to the million and a half epileptics in this country. A chemical defect in brain mechanism that is remediable by a medicinal has been found. This could be the break in our wall of ignorance concerning these diseases that researchers have been searching for many years. At the very least, it should be considered a milestone of progress.

Glutamine, the therapeutic chemical, could become as much a part of everyday conversation as was penicillin, streptomycin, or cortisone. There have been dramatic advances in our understanding of the so-called nerve-muscle diseases: myasthenia gravis, muscular dystrophy, and the like. New precision instruments, such as the encephalograph, have already paid off.

The committee has already made sure that the work on epilepsy and glutamine will go forward. The committee indicated they wished to increase, by \$750,000, the budget submitted by this Institute, to support this activity. The committee has also already provided that the blindness activities can be taken out of the standby status, so that a significant program can be developed. The committee recommends that \$400,000 be made available for this work.

I recommend that additional funds, to the extent of a million dollars, be made available for these activities, so that a more vigorous approach could be conducted in the area of cerebral palsy, muscular dystrophy, and other nerve-muscle disorders. The opportunities for alleviating diseases of the ear through research are limitless, and I hope the Institute will expand its activities in this area. I am convinced that, although these many fields could absorb, in a very effective manner, much more than the million dollars I recommend, this million dollars, together with the additional funds already recommended by the committee, would provide us with a program in this area of which the Congress could be proud.

I have attempted in these few remarks only to highlight some of the problems, together with some of the progress that has been made toward their solution. I have tried to indicate opportunities, as well as still unmet needs.

Our subcommittee, through its investigation of these activities, is convinced

that they are well managed, have been profitable in the past, and will continue to be sufficiently profitable in the future to justify the support by Congress of this broad program in medical research.

MENTAL HEALTH

Mental illness is not a killer, but is our most expensive single medical-care problem; 1 out of every 2 hospital beds is occupied by the mentally ill; 900,000 patients are treated in mental hospitals each year.

The economic loss is fantastic. Direct burden of hospital care, plus advances to neuropsychiatric veterans, equals taxes of \$1.1 billion annually; 40 percent of all disability discharges during World War II was for neuropsychiatric disorders. The important relationship of neuropsychiatric disorders to crime should be recognized. Again, research is the only possible answer.

The NIH budgets covering this area in recent years have been inadequate, but a sufficient beginning has been made to demonstrate the advisability of supporting this activity on a broader basis. Early active treatment of the mentally ill, although expensive, has proved to be an effective way of achieving a net reduction of costs. Some clarification of the factors underlying juvenile delinquency are now known. A possible biochemical basis for schizophrenia—the most common of the major psychoses—has been uncovered. A biochemical approach to the study of mental diseases already shows striking research opportunities.

At our hearings it was obvious that the Mental Health Institute has made just a beginning in its various areas of categorical responsibilities. The testimony brought out that these areas recently established could and should be pressed with more vigor. An increase in funds, aimed specifically at the research area, should make this possible. Testimony at our hearings indicates that such research should be on basic mechanisms in the laboratory, as well as on patient material in the clinic. Such distribution would appear to be the better part of wisdom.

THE NATIONAL HEART INSTITUTE

Heart disease is the leading cause of death, 800,000 in 1953. One out of each two deaths last year was due to cardiovascular disease. And not all of these deaths occur among the old—one-sixth of all deaths were in military ages from 20 to 39. One-third of all these deaths were in the productive years: 35 to 54. One billion dollars was paid in 1953 by insurance companies for heart-disease death claims. In addition to all this, it is obviously a leading cause of disability.

Again, in this field I am convinced that the problems of cardiovascular disease can only be ameliorated and solved through research, such as has been so successful to date under the auspices of the National Heart Institute.

As in the field of responsibility of the Cancer Institute, the present field under discussion has also given evidence of sound progress and continuing wide opportunity. A firm beginning of our un-

derstanding of the chemical basis of arteriosclerosis has been made. Cardiac surgery is now a reality. Rheumatic heart disease can now be prevented. Congestive heart failure can now be treated effectively and intelligently. New drugs are available to modify the course of hypertension.

Research in this area is required for a fundamental understanding of high blood pressure—for definite knowledge as to the cause, the prevention, and the modification of arteriosclerosis and consequent cerebral hemorrhage and coronary artery attack. More effective drugs are in prospect for the individual with high blood pressure, and ultimately a more thorough understanding is required of the basic mechanics underlying the failing heart, and the nervous and chemical control of the heart and the blood vessels. Active research now in progress in these areas should be pressed vigorously.

In conclusion, I wish to say that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is particularly interested in seeing these amendments adopted. I can think of no better way of paying our respects to him than to adopt these amendments unanimously.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement by the chairman of the committee, I am not going to make any remarks, but I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply gratified that the Committee on Appropriations has agreed with my proposed amendment to increase appropriations for medical research. The committee deserves credit for reviewing their earlier action and proposing an increase of \$4 million.

I will vote for the amendment, even though it does not provide the full funds that should be provided. The committee does not propose to increase the appropriation for support of research in arthritis, diabetes, and similar diseases. It does not provide funds to help in the construction of medical research laboratories. But the amendment moves us ahead, and that is my objective.

So long as I am a Member of this House, I shall press the case for medical research until this Nation can rest assured that every competent medical investigator has the funds he needs to do his work; that we are providing the Nation with an adequate pool of highly trained scientists for the years ahead, and that the scientists are working in facilities that enable them to advance their research most effectively.

This, in a nutshell, is what I consider the only sound national medical research policy. It would provide a program to carry out President Eisenhower's broad statement in his health message to the Congress of January 18, 1954:

In such direct research programs, and in Public Health Service research grants to State and local governments and to private research institutions, lies the hope of solving many of today's perplexing health problems.

I have fought consistently, over the past 8 years, to give the people of this Nation the medical research they want and need—the medical research that is the only hope for millions of sufferers from cancer, heart disease, arthritis, epilepsy, cerebral palsy, mental disorders, and muscular dystrophy.

This has been a battle against timidity and ignorance.

Year after year, Presidential advisers have prevailed upon the President to ask the Congress for medical research funds that have been consistently too low. This is where we have confronted timidity and limited vision. Time after time, I have urged the House to override these inadequate proposals, and the House on numerous occasions has done so. We are about to do so again. Through this series of actions, the House of Representatives has exercised real leadership in bringing into effect the most extensive and successful research attack on disease the world has ever seen.

We still have a long way to go, and the going will not be easy. The primary obstacle in the way of establishing a fully adequate national medical research program is ignorance.

I have had an exceptional opportunity over the past few years to discuss medical research at length with a wide cross-section of America's leading scientists and research physicians. While I cannot claim to understand the technical aspects of medical research, I have gained a profound respect for the complete and selfless dedication of these men, for their integrity, and for their competence, which will inevitably lead to a solution of today's baffling health problems. These men have taken the time to explain to me what is being accomplished and what the future may hold.

The significance of today's advances and of research possibilities has not been fully grasped by all the Members of the House nor by the American people. Those who are poorly informed fail to interpret the advances of research in terms of the prevention of disability and death for themselves, their families and friends, their own communities. But those who have been privileged with me to hear the full story at first hand know how vast the problems of disease are and what opportunity lies at hand to improve the health of the Nation by a scientific approach. When the meaning of research is understood in terms of lives saved and misery and pain relieved, then support of medical research will be viewed as a completely nonpartisan matter.

Failure to understand—ignorance of the facts—is more of a barrier to the establishment of a sound national program of medical research than is timidity. Ignorance of the facts is the major obstacle to improvement of our Nation's health.

Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to include in my remarks at this point a letter which I have received from one of the leading cardiologists in the world, Paul Dudley White, M. D., supporting increased appropriations for medical re-

search, particularly research into diseases of the heart:

PAUL DUDLEY WHITE, M. D.,
Boston, Mass., May 26, 1954.

Congressman JOHN FOGARTY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Re the 1955 budget for the National Heart Institute:

DEAR MR. FOGARTY: I am sending to you herewith a more detailed account than we had the opportunity to present to the committee at the hearing yesterday of the use for research projects by the National Heart Institute of the additional \$4,500,000 needed above the sum allowed by the Bureau of the Budget for 1955. The citizen's committee asked for \$11 million; the Bureau of the Budget allocated \$6,400,000; while the 1954 budget now in use has been \$6,843,000.

The wonderfully effective program for the study and control of heart disease already bearing rich fruit would be seriously jeopardized unless we take advantage and meet the challenge of the heart diseases that are still devastating the citizens of this country. I would add that we are making full use of the funds already given for research in all the categories of cardiovascular disease but they do not nearly cover the needs. Most of the detailed studies referred to below are being currently worked on but some still need to be initiated or greatly expanded, particularly in the case of the 2 or 3 more important conditions. We have available the research workers and the places in which we know the work can be done.

Most vital of all is the field of coronary heart disease which is produced by an abnormality of the coronary arteries which supply the heart muscle with its blood. This abnormal condition is called atherosclerosis and it is responsible for the vast majority of cases of angina pectoris and coronary thrombosis commonly called heart attacks. We need to supplement our current funds for studies of this condition by \$1,500,000 to \$2 million. This disease can be produced, studied, and treated in animals (rabbits, dogs, and monkeys, for example) but such animal studies are difficult, time-consuming, and expensive. Biochemical, physiological, anthropological and clinical tests on man himself under varying conditions of life as to diet, exercise, climate, physical, and nervous strains, occupation, and race are badly needed and have received very little attention compared to what can and should be done. The important relationship of this disease to sex and the hormones needs much more study as well as does heredity. These sources of vital information have hardly been tapped, partly because of the fact that the problem only recently was considered too difficult, the disease itself and deaths therefrom being regarded as insoluble, because they were God's will. The early diagnosis of this serious disease needs much sharpening and the prognosis amplified. Treatment continues to be unsatisfactory but new clues are appearing which demand further trial of possible measures of treatment. Most important of all, of course, is prevention which is dependent on the types of research mentioned at the beginning of this paragraph.

For hypertension, that is, high blood pressure, at least \$1 million extra are needed for several reasons: First, to study more intensively possible causes of high blood pressure, and there are a few clues appearing, and second, to test the effect of various methods of treatment in hypertensive patients. Fortunately, several measures have appeared, in particular now hypotensive drugs, to be added to the dietary and surgical treatment of the condition in severe cases. These new drugs of which there are many now are

very promising. They include such preparations as hexamethonium, protoveratrine, rauwolfia serpentina, and apresoline, but for purification of these preparations and the synthesis of new preparations and their careful testing on animals and man the process is very arduous, time-consuming, and expensive. There is much light, however, beginning to appear in this problem.

For the further development of cardiovascular surgery, new money is needed in addition to what is being used now very profitably. For this purpose, I am sure that \$500,000 can be used at once very profitably. We have a large number of young, very able, and ingenious surgeons concentrating on the heart who, every month or two, introduce new technics. They need much help in the way of new research funds for experimental work on animals before applying their technics to man.

One very much neglected field is that of the study of the cerebral circulation; that is, the blood vessels of the brain. A few studies are going on, but they are quite inadequate and as is well known, cerebrovascular attacks caused by embolism, thrombosis, or hemorrhage are very common, resulting in serious paralysis or death. At least, \$250,000 additional could be expended in this field.

For further researches on the best ways of rehabilitation of cardiac patients—almost a virgin field—much new money is needed and there again at least \$250,000 should be utilized at once.

One of the most important of all the special body tissues that has come under our wing, that is, under the National Heart Institute, is that of the blood. As mentioned yesterday by Dr. Jones, the minimum requirement for full utilization of the wonderful advances made by one group, namely, that of Dr. Cohn, of Boston and Cambridge, amounts to several hundred thousand dollars annually. There is inadequate support at the present time or further development of this vital research locally. Other blood studies through the country would increase to \$1 million our new requirements for blood research.

Perhaps most important of all is basic research, biochemical, physical, and physiological, which is at the root of advances in many fields. Because of the fact that much of this study does not have an immediate application, this field is unhappily not adequately supported. For the further development of such basic research, \$500,000 extra would be needed yearly.

Finally, still further money should be spent in the amplification of our researches in congenital heart disease, rheumatic heart disease, pulmonary heart disease, kidney arterial disease, neurocirculatory asthenia, and the range of the normal. These various conditions together should have an increase of \$500,000 to \$1 million.

Adding up these sums which are actually conservative figures, we have a total of \$5,500,000 to \$6,500,000. It is evident then that the \$4,600,000 additional money asked for research projects is well within the minimum needs of expansion but, of course, if this sum cannot be given, lesser amounts will still be invaluable.

Thank you for your kind consideration of our testimony.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL D. WHITE.

What are the facts?

Let me mention a few concerning diseases of the nervous system, which afflict to some degree 1 out of every 8 Americans. Cerebral palsy results in uncontrolled jerking of limbs and facial muscles, while leaving the reasoning functions of the brain at full strength.

Epileptics are subject to what is known as seizures—fits that may occur at rare intervals or several times a day. The intelligence of sufferers from epilepsy remains unimpaired, but they are denied the opportunity to work and use their minds because of their physical affliction. Muscular dystrophy causes muscles to wither and cease functioning. Multiple sclerosis belongs to this same general family of diseases. It is an obscure disease of the nervous system that appears gradually, progresses, and at times almost disappears. But over the long run, it disables and cripples as parts of the nervous system degenerate, leaving its victims ultimately helpless.

This is one of the diseases for which there is now no cure, and years of work may be required before the whole picture becomes clear. But meanwhile, research is being pushed ahead on a larger scale than at any time in our history. Five years ago, total research expenditures on this disease totaled \$30,000; now the level is \$300,000. Leads are developing. A team of scientists has been sent to Guam to determine precisely why a disease like multiple sclerosis—Lou Gehrig's disease—is 50 times more prevalent there than in this country. If they can find what it is in diet, environment, or inherited characteristics of those people that makes them so susceptible, we may have a lead to the origins of this group of neurological diseases. I had a part in increasing the level of support for research on multiple sclerosis and the related diseases, and I intend to press for further support as the work now in progress develops new clues and new approaches. By and large, the neurological diseases cripple and destroy the essence of life without killing their victims.

The plight of the victims of these diseases was made terribly clear to me in testimony over the years. The research story until recently has been one of spasmodic effort, lack of interest, and very slow progress. It was tremendously exciting to me, then, to hear in recent testimony before the subcommittee that at last a break in the wall has been found. It was gratifying to me personally and as a Member of Congress to find that this breakthrough developed in one of the institutes recently established by Congress, and that it was made possible in part by the unusual combination of research talent and research facilities in which we have all had hand. I refer, of course, to the clinical center at the National Institutes of Health, which has been in operation less than a year.

There, in the clinical center, a research team of the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness has come up with an extremely promising lead in the research battle against epilepsy. There is reason to believe that the major defect in epilepsy is a chemical deficiency in the brain, and that epileptic seizures can be controlled by the replacement of this substance in the brain tissues in the affected area.

It will take time and money and patience to follow up this lead. Now, the Members of Congress will be interested to know that the budget submitted to

the subcommittee did not contain sufficient funds to do this fully and rapidly. There followed, however, one of the gratifying experiences that can typify service on congressional committees that deal directly with programs that touch the very heart of the American people.

I became acutely aware of the import of this work as it was described to us by Dr. Pearce Bailey, director of the Neurological Institute. My interest spread to other members of the subcommittee. As a direct result, the committee report contains sizable additional funds for this Institute to prosecute these studies to the fullest extent, in order to bring the possible benefits of this research to the point of practical application without delay. For those of you who are essentially economy minded, it should be said that if this single research finding is confirmed, the cost of the clinical center facility—estimated at roughly \$60 million—may be repaid many times over. I know of no better illustration of the ways in which the Congress can work to assure the direction of Federal programs toward the public interest.

It became evident from the testimony of the same witness that the budget as submitted would permit no reasonable research effort in the whole field of blindness, although 300,000 Americans today are totally blind and an equal number are partially or almost totally so. This serious omission was also rectified in part through an addition to that Institute's budget.

Such a pattern as I have just described was repeated over and over in the programs of the National Institutes of Health. As I probed into the testimony of each witness, and ascertained the facts that lay behind the budget presentations, I found in every case significant areas in which essential work was not being done because of a shortage of funds, and at the same time significant areas of research progress which confirmed my belief that the investment in medical research is good economy as well as good for the American people.

Another area highlighted in the testimony was atherosclerosis, the major form of hardening of the arteries. A great killer and disabler, atherosclerosis causes strokes, heart attacks, and much of the mental disturbance among older persons. Three quarters of a million deaths in 1950 resulted from cardiovascular diseases, and of these, approximately 75 percent were the direct or indirect result of this condition. The Heart Institute has conducted and supported significant studies implicating a fatty substance in the blood called Cholesterol, as a possible cause of atherosclerosis, and have found a complex called the "clearing factor" which seems very promising in its ability to facilitate the handling of fatty molecules in the blood stream.

As many of you know, diabetes can be controlled by insulin and diet in many cases, but there is a lot that needs to be done in research laboratories before we have the knowledge to prevent or cure this disease. There are more than a million known diabetics in this country today. At the National Institutes of

Health, important studies are already giving us new knowledge about how insulin acts, what happens to sugars and fats in the body, and how the disease may be related to the nervous system. Some new studies in the clinical center are concentrating on the influence of fat and carbohydrate levels of the diet in the prevention of a condition that leads to diabetic coma.

I do not need to tell you of the problem of major proportions that is represented by mental illness. About 50 percent of the patients resident in State mental hospitals suffer from the mental illness known as schizophrenia. Most of them come to the hospital at an early age; they stay an average of 10 years. When it is realized that the State hospitals care for 86 percent of the hospitalized mentally ill, you can see the magnitude of the tragedy reflected in these figures on schizophrenic patients. In the Clinical Center, the National Institute of Mental Health is making one of the first integrated research attacks on this problem in the whole United States. The institute scientists have a promising lead in a drug known as lysergic acid, which produces in normal human beings a temporary condition comparable to that found in schizophrenia, permitting the disease to be studied under highly controlled conditions.

Arthritis and rheumatism, to cite another example, afflict approximately 10 million people in the United States. Rheumatoid arthritis, the most serious form, often leads to crippling deformities. The diagnosis of this disease is often difficult, but in the Clinical Center a test has been developed, based on the discovery that the blood of rheumatoid arthritis patients contains a substance that causes clumping of the red blood cells of sheep. Further work along these lines is needed if the test is to be made sufficiently accurate and practical for application in hospitals, clinics, or the office of the physician.

Another fact brought out by this testimony concerns the dreaded, fatal disease leukemia—cancer of the white blood cells. The cause of leukemia is entirely unknown. But scientists of the National Cancer Institute discovered recently that the thymus gland—a little-understood organ in the chest—may play an important role in leukemia development. Remove the thymus gland from mice that would ordinarily inherit leukemia, and the disease is retarded or prevented. Transplant thymic tissue from these mice to those of a leukemia-resistant strain, and the disease increases among the latter. This is only one of dozens of important clues that could lead to a major breakthrough in the cancer problem—with sufficient research support.

What is at stake here is literally a matter of life or death for hundreds of thousands of Americans—including some of us who are here today on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I have tried to understand why some Members of Congress have been reluctant to press aggressively for a sound national medical research program.

This reluctance cannot be simply a desire for economy. Expenditures in medical research are a long-range but gilt-edged investment. They pay dividends in dollars at a rate beyond the comprehension of investment brokers. They pay dividends in human terms that are more important than dollars to the strength and permanent well-being of our Nation.

This reluctance is not a matter of politics. The health of the American people is not an area where conflicting partisan interests have a place. I am reminded that last year, the first Eisenhower budget for the National Institutes of Health was just over \$65 million. As a result of House and Senate action, that was raised to \$71 million. Clearly, the elected representatives of the people felt that increased support of medical research was in the public interest. I am reminded, too, that the total appropriation for this important and productive research program has increased steadily each year since 1946—including the 2 years of the 80th Congress.

The reason for holding back on support of medical research cannot come from fear of bigness in the Federal Government. Federal support of medical research in the Nation's medical schools, universities, and other non-Federal research centers has brought new vitality to research throughout the Nation. Substantial increases for the laboratories of the National Institutes of Health themselves have been concentrated in two worthwhile areas. The first is expansion of the neglected field of neurology. The second, progress toward full use of the Nation's new and magnificent medical research laboratory—the Clinical Center at the National Institutes of Health.

Finally, it is inconceivable to me that any of my colleagues could fail to support this vital health program simply because they are not particularly interested in the havoc caused by disease, one of our principal enemies from within.

The immediate question is support of the amendment to increase by \$4 million the appropriation for the National Institutes of Health, so that it can increase its research grants by that amount for the research fight against cancer, heart disease, mental disorders, and neurological diseases.

The long-range question is not our willingness to accept this amendment, which I am sure we will adopt. The main question is whether we have the vision and courage to act boldly and consistently, year after year, to create the national medical research program worthy of this Nation and its people.

I, for one, will seize every opportunity to make such a program a reality.

I fought in the committee for an additional \$750,000 for research on epilepsy. I obtained an additional \$400,000 for research on problems of blindness. I insisted that \$1 million be added to each of the appropriations for research on heart disease, on cancer, on neurological diseases—epilepsy, muscular dystrophy, multiple sclerosis, cerebral palsy—and on mental disorders.

This is a skirmish in the campaign. It is an advance. It is not a large-scale advance, but this is the way progress comes.

I will fight for advances year by year until every resource that can be brought to bear on the great killers is committed to the battle.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may revise and extend their remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do this for the purpose of complimenting the chairman and the members of the subcommittee, and particularly the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], for their action in increasing by \$4 million the amounts for the four Institutes of Health mentioned in the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSHEY] which is now pending.

I know of no wiser way for us to expend any part of the taxpayers' money than to add \$1 million each to the appropriations for the National Cancer Institute, the National Heart Institute, the National Institute of Mental Health, and the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness. Cancer is killing almost a quarter of a million Americans every year. The most widespread destroyer of life in the United States today is a group of diseases called cardiovascular, involving the heart and the arteries and which may also affect the brain and kidneys. They cause more than half of all the deaths in the Nation. Each year, more than three-quarters of a million Americans must receive mental hospital care. Each year, 22,000 of us lose our sight. And we simply must have adequate medical research into such terrible afflictions as epilepsy and cerebral palsy, multiple sclerosis, muscular dystrophy, and Parkinson's disease.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to read to the House the following paragraph from Public Affairs Pamphlet No. 201 entitled "Medical Research May Save Your Life" by Gilbert Cant:

It is literally impossible to estimate, let alone to overestimate, how much it will mean to humanity when medical science succeeds in banishing such terms as "cardiac cripple," "cancer victim," and "mental patient" from our everyday speech and relegating them to medical textbooks alongside yellow fever and diphtheria. But we know, though we cannot measure, the emotional costs of continued failure to reach this goal. And to some extent we can compute the economic costs. We know, for example, that as a result of the 15-percent decline in the death rate from 1937 to 1952, the earning power of the American people in 1 year alone was increased by almost \$3 billion. And the Government thereby gained over \$477 million in taxes in 1 year alone.

The following recent article by George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion, which I shall include in my extension of remarks, indicates that the public overwhelmingly favors more Federal funds to study cancer:

WOULD BE WILLING TO PAY MORE TAXES
TO PROVIDE \$100 MILLION TO STUDY CANCER
PREVENTION, CURE

(By George Gallup, director, American
Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., April 29.—The American public would favor an increase of at least five times the amount now appropriated by Congress for the study and treatment of the disease which ranks second only to heart trouble as a cause of death—cancer.

And a majority is even willing to see taxes increased to provide the money.

These facts are disclosed in coast-to-coast questioning of the public by Institute reporters. Interviewing took place during mid-April, first set aside by President Roosevelt as Cancer Month.

The National Cancer Institute, conducted by the Federal Government, received an appropriation of \$20,237,000 from Congress in 1953.

Today's survey finds that almost 8 out of 10 adults (79 percent) would be willing to see the Government spend \$100 million for cancer study and control.

Public reaction was tested in the following manner:

"Would you approve or disapprove of having the Government spend \$100 million to find possible ways of preventing or curing cancer in this country?"

The vote:

	Percent
Approve.....	79
Disapprove.....	16
No opinion.....	5
Total.....	100

Those who approved were then asked:
"Would you be willing to pay more taxes to provide this money?"

	Percent
Yes.....	62
No.....	13
No opinion.....	4
Approving.....	79

Approval of the idea was found among all major groups in the population. Men and women of all ages and in all levels of society favored a \$100 million appropriation by majorities ranging from 72 to 83 percent.

Of interest is the fact that persons who had attended high school or grade school are somewhat more in favor than are those who attended college.

Of interest is the fact that persons who had attended high school or grade school are somewhat more in favor than are those who attended college.

Roughly 6 out of every 10 in all population groups indicated their willingness to pay higher taxes for the purpose.

As a matter of fact, there is evidence that the country would be willing to see a congressional appropriation for cancer research of twice the amount proposed in today's survey.

In 1945, and again in 1946, the institute polled the Nation on the suggestion of a \$200 million appropriation, the money to be raised by additional taxation, as follows:

"Should Congress pass a law which would provide \$200 million for the study and treatment of cancer in this country?"

The trend:

	1945 Percent	1946 Percent
Yes.....	81	82
No.....	10	11
No opinion.....	9	7
Total.....	100	100

A majority in both surveys said they would be willing to pay additional taxes to sup-

port the program, although the number in 1946 was somewhat smaller than in 1945.

In addition to the Government's program, the American Cancer Society raised more than \$19 million last year to combat the disease. The society's 1954 cancer crusade is being conducted this month.

According to the United States Public Health Service, the latest available estimate shows that 224,130 people died of cancer in 1952. The figure is based on a 10-percent sample of death certificates.

Mr. Chairman, while I have the floor I shall take advantage of the opportunity to point out, as was more eloquently pointed out here on the floor yesterday by the esteemed gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] and many other distinguished Members, that no Member of this House has ever been more diligent and conscientious in carrying out his duties on the Committee on Appropriations than has been the respected gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] during all of the past 8 years.

Eight years ago, my friend JOHN FOGARTY became a member of our committee and was assigned to what was then known as the Labor Department-Federal Security Agency Subcommittee, now known as the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare Departments Subcommittee. He has assiduously applied himself to this bill and the work of this subcommittee ever since.

We all know of JOHN's unfortunate illness last year, directly brought on by many months of tiring work on the Committee on Appropriations and on this very appropriation bill. Thank God today for his recovery. He was the highly capable chairman of this subcommittee from 1949 to 1952. He succeeded, as chairman, the late distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, Frank Keefe, who also suffered illness as the result of his tremendous work on the Appropriations Committee. Frank Keefe had been a vigorous man who placed first above all his activities in the House the matter of sufficient appropriations for the Public Health Service and the National Institutes of Health. He and I differed many times, and most vigorously, as many here will recall, but never with regard to the Public Health Service or the National Institutes of Health.

JOHN FOGARTY, who participated in the original planning, the acquisition of the land, and the first allowances of funds for the Clinical Center of the National Institutes of Health, the \$60 million project built out here at Bethesda, has been a great successor to the late Frank Keefe, of Wisconsin. As chairman and as the ranking minority member of this subcommittee he has been the veritable leader in Congress in the field of public health. Due to his efforts and the remarks which he made not only in general debate the day before yesterday but last Friday morning before the full Committee on Appropriations, we now have a committee amendment to the bill increasing by \$4 million the funds for the National Cancer Institute, the National Heart Institute, the National Institute of Mental Health, and the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and

Blindness, which I trust and am sure will be promptly adopted.

(Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as having been read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS: On page 27, line 2, strike out "\$1,525,000" and insert "\$1,690,000."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to add \$165,000 to the appropriation for the Children's Bureau to enable the Children's Bureau to coordinate the activities of States and cities in the country with respect to juvenile delinquency.

I do not think anybody here needs to be convinced about what has been happening to that field. We have had some very serious setbacks in terms of the amenability of youth to law, and this is but the extreme indication of the difficulties of adjustment and outlook under which young people labor today. This has been found by many who have investigated the subject. It has been thoroughly looked into in the other body by a subcommittee under the chairmanship of our colleague the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. HENDRICKSON. The magazines and newspapers have been full of it. Youth's problems today have been attributed to the difficulties and frustrations faced by youth in this A-bomb and H-bomb age following World War II.

We have 43 million boys and girls under 18 in our country. Of these 1 million come to the attention of the police every year. We spend about \$25 billion annually in this country to fight crime.

The effort here is, with a very modest expenditure, to help deal with that situation in a modern and enlightened way.

This is a subject that should very seriously interest every Member of the House. I would like, also, to mention this to the House parenthetically—this expenditure of \$165,000 is on its way through the Bureau of the Budget now for approval.

There is always a lot of complaint here about the fact that some very desirable things fall to the other body because it acts on bills, appropriation bills particularly, after we do. Here is a situation which is on its way to the other body through the Budget Bureau, and which is going as an administration supplemental request, and will come through later after we act on this bill, unless we act on this amendment now. That is my principal reason for offering it to the House.

Dr. Eliot said that this modest expenditure of \$165,000 will provide an opportunity for the Children's Bureau to do the following:

To strengthen their advice on juvenile court problems, probation work, police problems, and problems of the training schools, detention homes, and problems related to special types of service that are being developed in one community or another about youth. (P. 44 of hearings.)

Mr. Chairman, there are many youth commissions in many States, and I should like to name some: Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Kansas, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

All have youth commissions. The job which can be done on the national level in coordinating the work of these commissions and seeing that they exchange information which each has for the other and the experience which each has for the other represents the first and a very modest step in the acceptance of the responsibility for this very grave problem of youth adjustment and of juvenile delinquency on the national level, where it properly belongs.

I think all of us must answer to our own consciences in terms of what is going on with the young people of our country unless we are prepared to equip an agency which is already active and has enormous experience in that field, where we would be building on a foundation already established, not a new one, to help the States and the cities to do the job that needs to be done if our youth are to be adequately assisted by Government.

I think we are all aware of the drastic increase in the crime of stealing automobiles, for instance, which has occurred in the youth field, also in vandalism and other similar occurrences around the country. It is necessary to direct attention to the fact that something can be done about it in the national establishment at a very modest cost. The place to do it is right here and now in respect to this particular appropriation for the Children's Bureau.

It is amply justified at page 442 of the hearings, where this very subject was covered, where the \$165,000 was referred to and where Dr. Eliot, the distinguished head of the Children's Bureau, described what could be and would be done effectively with that money. Indeed the subcommittee on youth of the other body it appears has given a basis for support to exactly that program urged by Dr. Eliot.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, the last 3½ minutes to be reserved to the chairman of the subcommittee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. PFOST].

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Chairman, juvenile delinquency has risen again for the fifth

consecutive year. The Federal Government must take some responsibility, and some leadership in helping the States and communities to meet the alarming growth in crime and serious misbehavior among our youth.

The need for Federal assistance in combatting the rising tide of juvenile delinquency is the theme of the interim report recently issued by the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, which is ably chairmanned by Senator HENDRICKSON, of New Jersey.

My mail indicates that the people in my congressional district are also concerned about the great increase of delinquency among children, and are looking to Congress to provide them with some help in organizing their own resources to combat it.

I am sure the people of my congressional district are no different than the people elsewhere in the country. I understand also that the President has a request on its way to Congress asking that the 1955 budget be increased \$165,000 to enable the Children's Bureau to send trained workers into the field to assist the training schools, police, and probation officers, and to give aid to other agencies dealing with delinquent children. It is my understanding that the money will also finance some much needed research.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to urge that this important amendment be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. I, too, rise in support of the Javits amendment. Today we are caught in a world in which the conditions in which we live instill and aggravate any sense of insecurity which we, as adults, might have, let alone the insecurity in which our children live. Our children never have had any feeling of real security. They have been brought into a world torn by war and torn by oppression which we never experienced when we ourselves were children. They have been tossed about in the turmoil of the war in Korea. They are bombarded daily with doubts and fears about communism, by the possibility of the draft, and by the rapid change in economic conditions. Is there any wonder then that children break under the tensions in which they find themselves?

I personally believe that this problem is essentially a local one, that it must be solved primarily in the homes and in the neighborhood. Never before have we had greater need for the mobilization of all the social forces for good which exist in the local community. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the goals which we seek on a local level can be helped greatly by coordination with activities on a national level. I believe this amendment is really a necessary one.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. As a matter of fact, the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, headed by Senator HENDRICKSON, has asked, and I quote, "That funds be made available to enlarge the con-

sultative services of the Children's Bureau in relation to the problems of juvenile delinquency," and that is exactly the basis for this amendment.

Mr. YATES. I think it is a very good idea. Our ultimate goal must be a good family life. We must try to protect our children before they are hurt. What we are seeking to do is to help the children before they are hurt rather than punishing them after they become delinquents. I think this amendment will help.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I rise to compliment the gentleman from Illinois as well as the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. Frost] on their arguments on behalf of the pending amendment. The distinguished gentleman from Illinois offered a similar amendment to this bill when it was considered in the full Committee on Appropriations last Friday. I do trust that the amendment will now prevail.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does the gentleman believe that the parents are so unmindful and incompetent and incapable in taking care of their own children and of instructing them that we must call upon the Federal Government or somebody appointed by the Federal Government or someone in the Government to go down and tell them how to behave?

Mr. YATES. I do not think that is contemplated by this amendment. Parents must take care of their own children and they bear the primary responsibility for bringing them up properly. The family unit is still the basis for our entire society and must be preserved and protected. The fact remains, however, that an increasing number of children are becoming delinquent. Local communities all over the country are becoming overburdened with the increasing number of juvenile cases. As I understand this amendment, it seeks only to coordinate the activities of local governments in trying to help prevent children from becoming delinquent and helping those who have gone astray. There are fundamental social services that have to be performed on a national level.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, we are all in accord with the objectives of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Over a month ago Dr. Eliot, head of the Children's Bureau, testified before our committee that this problem is being studied at a high level in the White House, and she thought that a supplemental request for this particular activity would be submitted to the Congress in the near future. I think we should wait until the proposition is submitted to us, because we will then have the benefit of their study and their findings. Then, we can consider their request in

the regular, established manner, rather than at this time before we have any definite program to act on.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Did not the hearings disclose that Dr. Eliot has stated that this was a necessary appropriation and that it would be placed before the Congress at a later date? The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] does nothing but what the Children's Bureau has requested. Is that not true?

Mr. BUSBEY. I do not disagree with the gentleman that it is a necessary thing, but I want to handle it in the regular way and in an orderly manner. I think we will have it in a supplemental request before long and then we will have the benefit of all the thinking and planning that goes into setting up a program of this importance. For that reason, I hope the amendment will not be adopted at this time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. As a matter of fact, it is going through the Bureau of the Budget. It is going to go to the other body and they will act on it. That is exactly what I said in my remarks, and we might as well recognize the actualities and do the things that need to be done here instead of leaving it to the other side to do the good things.

Mr. BUSBEY. I do not believe it makes much difference which side first acts on the request. The fundamental thing is the problem itself, and the program to solve the problem. That is what we are interested in. I do not care whether the Senate acts first or not.

Mr. JAVITS. It will enormously accelerate meeting the problem if we act on it now and know what the amount is.

Mr. BUSBEY. We do not know what amount will be required for this program. It may be \$100,000, or it may be \$200,000. Dr. Eliot's estimate was made over a month ago and before a review by the Bureau of the Budget. We do not know what it is now.

Mr. JAVITS. She gave the number of jobs; she gave the number of man-hours, and she said exactly what it would do.

Mr. BUSBEY. Oh, she is all set up ready to go; I will admit that, but she has not been given the green light. I think she should wait until she gets the green light.

Mr. JAVITS. I think we ought to give it to her.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I wonder if the gentleman might not consider having the committee adopt this amendment. It is just a matter of peanuts. The committee claimed a saving of \$16,339,250 in the budget estimates. According to my figures, \$21,303,750 in amendments have now been added to the bill.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAVITS) there were—ayes 35, noes 86.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCONNELL: On page 34, line 3, strike out "\$3,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,124,000."

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, the Bureau of the Budget recommended an amount of \$3,170,000 for the operation of the Federal Mediation-Conciliation Service for the fiscal year 1955. The Appropriations Committee cut that figure down to \$3 million.

Last year, fiscal year 1954, the Federal Mediation-Conciliation Service had appropriations totaling \$3,200,000. By economies, they are planning to return at the end of this fiscal year, 1954, \$50,000 to the Treasury which they will not spend. They have done that through strict economy; they have reduced the number of mediators from 240 to 225; they have cut the number of regions from 12 to 8, to effect a savings of approximately \$72,000. They have made other changes to effect savings in operations. They feel that a further cut below the figure which I have submitted here, \$3,124,000, would seriously impair the effectiveness of that service.

I have not always been in accord with the operations of certain of our bureaus dealing with labor-management relations, as you know. I do believe, however, that the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service performs one of the finest jobs and services in the field of labor-management relations.

There are two important parts of their services I would like to call specifically to your attention: One of them is to assist in getting a plant in operation which is struck and closed down. A closed plant makes no profits from which to pay taxes. I wish to emphasize again that the one service that has more to do with the opening up of a struck plant than any other is the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. The second part of their activities which I like has to do with prevention of strikes. It would be very good if in the course of labor-management relations we could prevent walkouts and shutdowns.

The Department's Mediation and Conciliation Service has embarked on a program that might be called "preventive action"; in other words, mediators and conciliators go into the different plants, talk to the management and to the labor groups, and seek if possible to avoid a continuance or a widening of differences that occur, in the hope and in the expectation that they will avoid actual shutdowns of plants.

I feel that these two types of activities are vital in the efficient functioning of our industrial system which is so important at a time like this when our national

security is threatened with serious international tensions.

You may ask: Why do we not request the full restoration to the \$3,170,000 mentioned by the Federal Bureau of the Budget? The Department itself feels that they can through economies in their operations absorb an additional amount which will enable them to get along with \$3,124,000; in other words, they will absorb a cut below the figure advocated by the Bureau of the Budget in the amount of \$46,000.

I have been in touch with the head of the service, Mr. McCoy, who is cooperating on the figure of \$3,124,000; and if he secures that he will be relatively satisfied.

What I am asking in this amendment is to restore \$124,000 of the \$170,000 cut that was made below Bureau of the Budget's recommended \$3,170,000.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I am greatly disappointed that no funds have been provided in this bill for construction of research facilities. The Department did not submit a figure for construction needs but there was ample testimony of the requirements throughout the country for funds to build the laboratories in which work and discoveries would be made in the various fields of medicine represented by the Institutes of Public Health.

As a matter of fact, the Senate committee, the counterpart to our own, requested the Department last year to make a survey of research construction needs. That survey was completed after the executive budget had been prepared for fiscal year 1955.

It showed information had been collected from 96—39 States—of the 123 institutions which had previously requested Public Health Service construction grants in the amount of \$107,210,902. In addition 23 institutions because of the pressure of time, did not submit information early enough to be incorporated in the material assembled. These institutions had previously indicated a need for \$47,085,312. A total of \$154,296,214 has therefore been requested for construction grants for research purposes.

The 96 institutions replying indicate the following distribution among the categorical diseases:

Arthritis and metabolic diseases, 53 institutions, totaling \$16,469,954.

Cancer, 45 institutions, totaling \$22,138,654.

Dental, 36 institutions, totaling \$9,143,008.

Heart, 74 institutions, totaling \$25,852,214.

Mental health, 40 institutions, totaling \$14,538,243.

Neurological diseases and blindness, including rehabilitation, 52 institutions, totaling \$19,068,829.

The 23 institutions had indicated a distribution as follows:

Arthritis and metabolic diseases, 9 institutions, totaling \$6,999,500.

Cancer, 16 institutions, totaling \$7,302,587.

Dental, 5 institutions, totaling \$3,701,330.

Heart, 19 institutions, totaling \$10,156,727.

Mental health, 11 institutions, totaling \$5,299,428.

Neurological diseases and blindness, 11 institutions, totaling \$13,625,740.

I regret that it was not possible for the House to consider these needs but I hope that when the Senate acts, with a full statement of research construction requirements before it, it will provide funds in reasonable amounts. I shall strive to maintain in conference any construction funds the Senate votes because I think it is one of the soundest investments we can make. One of the witnesses testifying in behalf of cancer needs this year, James S. Adams of New York, referring to construction funds granted in 1947 and 1948 said:

I am glad to tell you that the expectation that this would attract other funds was fully realized. For every Government dollar, six additional dollars have come from private and other local sources, so that with \$16,303,000 of Federal funds there has been nearly \$100 million of additional funds, or a total building program of upwards of \$120 million resulting.

The \$16,303,000 was allocated to 55 different construction projects and 49 institutions in 27 States and substantially all of the projects have been completed. However, there has been no appropriation for construction in 1951, 1952, 1953 or 1954, although we have advocated the completion of this program in each of the last 4 years.

At the present time there are on file with the National Cancer Institute requests for construction grants from 61 institutions totalling over \$29 million. These institutions are located in 29 States and the District of Columbia. Our information is that many of these projects could start immediately were funds available and that all of them could be underway within 12 months. As a start on this backlog we advocate a construction appropriation of \$6 million for fiscal 1955. This we believe is necessary in order that we may consolidate the gains which have already been made in this fight against cancer and so that we may wage the battle on an ever-expanding scale until victory is achieved.

Other witnesses testified along the same lines, and I am constrained to feel when I am told by an eminent banker that a specific financial result is obtained that as a banker we can take his word. I know of no other area of appropriations where the expenditure of a dollar by the Federal Government produces six additional dollars for other sources, and I, therefore, believe and hope that we will be able to do something about construction together with the Senate before this bill becomes law. I also hope that in the coming year the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare gives this problem its attention and comes to us for fiscal year 1956 with a clear and careful appraisal of construction needs and a sound request in terms of funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 80, noes 33.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NICHOLSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9447) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. RABAUT (at the request of Mr. FOGARTY) was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 8, there appears on page 7420, in the third column, a statement I made during a discussion with my colleague, Congressman BUSBEY, of Illinois, and the other Members of the House, which reads as follows:

Mr. THORNBERRY. What I want to do, and I think what the gentleman has suggested, is to get over to the Department and the budget the feeling of this committee, as Representatives of the Congress, that we expect to be done for Gallaudet what was done for Howard University. Over a period of years, since the last building was built at Howard University, over \$25 million has been spent. I think that is fine, but I think the Congress should do for this school what they have done for Howard University. I appreciate the gentleman's interest.

This statement is in error and I ask unanimous consent that it be changed to read as follows:

Mr. THORNBERRY. What I want to do, and I think what the gentleman has suggested, is to get over to the Department and the budget the feeling of this committee, as Representatives of the Congress, that we expect to be done for Gallaudet what was done for Howard University. Over a period of years, since the last building was built at Gallaudet College, over \$25 million has been spent for the construction of buildings at Howard University. I think that is fine, but

83^D CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 9447

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 11, 1954

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Depart-
5 ments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and
6 related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending
7 June 30, 1955, namely:

1 TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

2 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

3 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
4 Office of the Secretary of Labor (hereafter in this title
5 referred to as the Secretary) , including services as authorized
6 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ;
7 teletype news service; and payment in advance when
8 authorized by the Secretary for dues or fees for library
9 membership in organizations whose publications are avail-
10 able to members only or to members at a price lower than
11 to the general public; \$1,300,000, of which not more than
12 \$60,000 shall be for international labor affairs.

13 OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

14 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
15 Office of the Solicitor, \$1,450,000.

16 BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS

17 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
18 promotion of industrial safety, employment stabilization, and
19 amicable industrial relations for labor and industry; per-
20 formance of safety functions of the Secretary under the Fed-
21 eral Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (5 U. S. C.
22 784 (c)) ; performance of the functions vested in the Sec-
23 retary by title I of the Labor-Management Relations Act,
24 1947 (29 U. S. C. 159 (f) and (g)) ; and not less than

1 \$75,000 for the work of the President's Committee on Na-
2 tional Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, as au-
3 thorized by the Act of July 11, 1949 (63 Stat. 409) and
4 provided further that no part of the appropriation for the
5 President's Committee shall be subject to reduction or trans-
6 fer to any other department or agency under the provisions
7 of any existing law; including purchase of reports and of
8 material for informational exhibits and expenses of attendance
9 of cooperating officials and consultants at conferences con-
10 cerned with the work of the Bureau of Labor Standards;
11 \$665,000.

12 BUREAU OF VETERANS' REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS

13 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to
14 render assistance in connection with the exercise of re-
15 employment rights under section 8 of the Selective Training
16 and Service Act of 1940, as amended (50 U. S. C. App.
17 308), the Service Extension Act of 1941, as amended, the
18 Army Reserve and Retired Personnel Service Law of 1940,
19 as amended, and section 9 of the Universal Military Train-
20 ing and Service Act, and, under the Act of June 23, 1943,
21 as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 1472), of persons who have
22 performed service in the Merchant Marine, \$300,000.

23 BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP

24 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to en-
25 able the Secretary to conduct a program of encouraging

1 apprentice training as authorized by the Act of August 16,
2 1937 (29 U. S. C. 50) , \$3,100,000.

3 BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

4 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
5 general administration of the employment service and unem-
6 ployment compensation programs, including temporary em-
7 ployment of persons, without regard to the civil-service laws,
8 for the farm placement migratory labor program; and not
9 to exceed \$10,000 for services as authorized by section 15
10 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; \$4,650,000,
11 of which \$1,100,000 shall be for carrying into effect the
12 provisions of title IV (except section 602) of the Service-
13 men's Readjustment Act of 1944.

14 Grants to States for unemployment compensation and
15 employment service administration: For grants in accord-
16 ance with the provisions of the Act of June 6, 1933, as
17 amended (29 U. S. C. 49-49n), for carrying into effect
18 section 602 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944,
19 for grants to the States as authorized in title III of the Social
20 Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 501-503) , including,
21 upon the request of any State, the purchase of equipment,
22 and the payment of rental for space made available to
23 such State in lieu of grants for such purpose, for nec-
24 essary expenses in connection with the operation of em-
25 ployment office facilities and services in the District of

1 Columbia, and for expenses not otherwise provided for,
2 necessary for carrying out title IV of the Veterans' Readjust-
3 ment Assistance Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 684), \$216,-
4 400,000, of which \$16,400,000 shall be available only
5 to the extent that the Secretary finds necessary to meet
6 increased costs of administration resulting from changes
7 in a State law or increases in the numbers of claims
8 filed and claims paid over those upon which the State's
9 basic grant (or the allocation for the District of Columbia)
10 was based, which increased costs of administration cannot
11 be provided for by normal budgetary adjustments: *Provided*,
12 That notwithstanding any provision to the contrary in section
13 302 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended, the Secre-
14 tary of Labor shall from time to time certify to the Secretary
15 of the Treasury for payment to each State found to be in
16 compliance with the requirements of the Act of June 6, 1933,
17 and, except in the case of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands,
18 with the provisions of section 303 of the Social Security Act,
19 as amended, such amounts as he determines to be necessary
20 for the proper and efficient administration of its unemploy-
21 ment compensation law and of its public employment offices:
22 *Provided further*, That such amounts as may be agreed upon
23 by the Department of Labor and the Post Office Department
24 shall be used for the payment, in such manner as said parties
25 may jointly determine, of postage for the transmission of

1 official mail matter in connection with the administration of
2 unemployment compensation systems and employment serv-
3 ices by States receiving grants herefrom.

4 In carrying out the provisions of said Act of June 6,
5 1933, the provisions of section 303 (a) (1) of the Social
6 Security Act, as amended, relating to the establishment and
7 maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, shall
8 apply.

9 None of the funds appropriated by this title to the
10 Bureau of Employment Security for grants-in-aid of State
11 agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of operation
12 of said agencies including the salaries and expenses of officers
13 and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld from the
14 said agencies of any States which have established by legis-
15 lative enactment and have in operation a merit system and
16 classification and compensation plan covering the selection,
17 tenure in office, and compensation of their employees, be-
18 cause of any disapproval of their personnel or the manner
19 of their selection by the agencies of the said States, or the
20 rates of pay of said officers or employees.

21 Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For mak-
22 ing, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to
23 States under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended,
24 and under the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended, for the first
25 quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may

1 be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures
2 made thereunder for payments under such title and under
3 such Act of June 6, 1933, to be charged to the appropriation
4 therefor for that fiscal year.

5 Unemployment compensation for veterans: For pay-
6 ments to unemployed veterans as authorized by title IV of
7 the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952,
8 \$55,600,000.

9 Unemployment compensation for veterans, next succeed-
10 ing fiscal year: For making, after May 31 of the current
11 fiscal year, payments to States, as authorized by title IV
12 of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, such
13 sums as may be necessary to pay benefits for the first quarter
14 of the next succeeding fiscal year, and the obligations and
15 expenditures thereunder shall be charged to the appropria-
16 tion therefor for that fiscal year.

17 Salaries and expenses, Mexican farm labor program:
18 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to
19 carry out the functions of the Department of Labor under
20 the Act of July 12, 1951 (Public Law 78), as amended,
21 including temporary employment of persons without regard
22 to the civil service laws, \$1,521,000.

23 BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION

24 Salaries and expenses: For necessary administrative
25 expenses and not to exceed \$112,000 for the Employees'

1 Compensation Appeals Board, \$2,030,000, together with
2 not to exceed \$90,000 to be derived from the War Claims
3 Fund created by section 13 (a) of the War Claims Act
4 of 1948 (50 U. S. C. 2012).

5 Employees' compensation fund: For the payment of
6 compensation and other benefits and expenses (except ad-
7 ministrative expenses) authorized by law and accruing dur-
8 ing the current or any prior fiscal year, including payments
9 to other Federal agencies for medical and hospital services
10 pursuant to agreement approved by the Bureau of Employ-
11 ees' Compensation; continuation of payment of benefits as
12 provided for under the head "Civilian War Benefits" in the
13 Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1947; the
14 advancement of costs for enforcement of recoveries in third-
15 party cases; the furnishing of medical and hospital services
16 and supplies, treatment, and funeral and burial expenses,
17 including transportation and other expenses incidental to
18 such services, treatment, and burial, for such enrollees of the
19 Civilian Conservation Corps as were certified by the Director
20 of such Corps as receiving hospital services and treatment
21 at Government expense on June 30, 1943, and who are
22 not otherwise entitled thereto as civilian employees of the
23 United States, and the limitations and authority of the Act
24 of September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U. S. C. 796), shall
25 apply in providing such services, treatment, and expenses in

1 such cases; such amount as may be required during the
 2 current fiscal year: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall
 3 be available for payments pursuant to sections 4 (c) and
 4 5 (f) of the War Claims Act of 1948 (50 U. S. C. 2012)
 5 and shall be credited with advances or reimbursements there-
 6 for from the War Claims Fund created by section 13 (a)
 7 of said War Claims Act of 1948.

8 BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

9 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
 10 work of the Bureau, including advances or reimbursement
 11 to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees
 12 for services rendered, and not to exceed \$15,000 for serv-
 13 ices as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,
 14 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$5,350,000.

15 WOMEN'S BUREAU

16 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
 17 work of the Women's Bureau, as authorized by the Act of
 18 June 5, 1920 (29 U. S. C. 11-16), including purchase of
 19 reports and material for informational exhibits, \$348,000.

20 WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

21 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for per-
 22 forming the duties imposed by the Fair Labor Standards
 23 Act of 1938, as amended, and the Act to provide conditions
 24 for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by

1 the United States, approved June 30, 1936, as amended
2 (41 U. S. C. 35-45), including reimbursement to State,
3 Federal, and local agencies and their employees for inspec-
4 tion services rendered, and not to exceed \$3,000 for ex-
5 penses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants
6 at conferences concerned with the work of the Division,
7 \$6,000,000.

8 GENERAL PROVISIONS

9 SEC. 102. Appropriations under this title available for
10 salaries and expenses shall be available for stenographic
11 reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
12 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and for expenses of
13 attendance at meetings concerned with the function or activ-
14 ity for which any such appropriation is made.

15 This title may be cited as the "Department of Labor
16 Appropriation Act, 1955".

17 TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCA-
18 TION, AND WELFARE

19 AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

20 Education of the blind: For carrying out the Act of
21 August 4, 1919, as amended (20 U. S. C. 101), \$175,000.

22 COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF

23 Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of Co-
24 lumbia Institution for the Deaf, including personal services
25 and miscellaneous expenses, and repairs and improvements,

1 \$410,000: *Provided*, That the Columbia Institution for the
2 Deaf shall be paid by the District of Columbia, in advance
3 at the beginning of each quarter, at the rate of \$1,295 per
4 school year for each student attending said Institution
5 pursuant to the Act of March 1, 1901 (31 D. C. Code
6 1008).

7 Construction: For the construction of a library-class
8 room building at the Columbia Institution for the Deaf
9 \$240,000, to remain available until expended; and for
10 alterations, \$19,000; in all, \$259,000.

11 FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

12 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses for
13 carrying out the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act,
14 as amended (21 U. S. C. 301-392); the Tea Importation
15 Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 41-50); the Import Milk
16 Act (21 U. S. C. 141-149); the Federal Caustic Poison
17 Act (15 U. S. C. 401-411); and the Filled Milk Act, as
18 amended (21 U. S. C. 61-64); reporting and illustrating
19 the results of investigations; purchase of chemicals, appa-
20 ratus, and scientific equipment; not to exceed \$2,000 for
21 payment in advance for special tests and analyses by con-
22 tract; and payment of fees, travel, and per diem in connection
23 with studies of new developments pertinent to food and drug
24 enforcement operations; \$5,100,000.

25 Salaries and expenses, certification and inspection serv-

ices: For expenses necessary for the certification or inspection of certain products in accordance with sections 406, 504, 506, 507, 604, 702A, and 706 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 346, 354, 356, 357, 364, 372a, and 376), the aggregate of the advance deposits during the current fiscal year to cover payment of fees by applicants for certification or inspection of such products, to remain available until expended. The total amount herein appropriated shall be available for personal services; purchase of chemicals, apparatus, and scientific equipment; and the refund of advance deposits for which no service has been rendered.

FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for operation and maintenance, including repairs; furnishing, repairing, and cleaning of wearing apparel used by employees in the performance of their official duties; transfer of funds to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Howard University" for salaries of technical and professional personnel detailed to the hospital; payments to the appropriation of Howard University for actual cost of heat, light, and power furnished by such university; \$2,880,000: *Provided*, That no intern or resident physician receiving compensation from this appropriation on a full-time basis shall receive compensation in the form of wages or salary

1 from any other appropriation in this title: *Provided further*,
2 That the District of Columbia shall pay by check to Freed-
3 men's Hospital, upon the Surgeon General's request, in ad-
4 vance at the beginning of each quarter, such amount as the
5 Surgeon General calculates will be earned on the basis of
6 rates approved by the Bureau of the Budget for the care
7 of patients certified by the District of Columbia. Bills ren-
8 dered by the Surgeon General on the basis of such calcula-
9 tions shall not be subject to audit or certification in advance
10 of payment; but proper adjustment of amounts which have
11 been paid in advance on the basis of such calculations shall
12 be made at the end of each quarter: *Provided further*, That
13 the Surgeon General may delegate the responsibilities im-
14 posed upon him by the foregoing proviso.

15 HOWARD UNIVERSITY

16 Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of How-
17 ard University, including personal services and miscellaneous
18 expenses and repairs to buildings and grounds, \$2,720,000.

19 Construction of buildings: For the construction and
20 equipment of buildings and facilities, under the supervision
21 of the General Services Administration, on the grounds of
22 Howard University, including engineering and architectural
23 services and travel, to remain available until expended, as
24 follows:

25 For a preclinical medical building, together with altera-

1 tions and installations in connection with such construction,
2 \$4,436,000.

3 For a power substation, together with necessary altera-
4 tions within the power plant, \$272,000.

5 For repairs to the power plant, \$100,000.

6 Construction of buildings (liquidation of contract au-
7 thorization) : For payment of obligations incurred under
8 authority previously provided, to enter into contracts for the
9 construction of the following: Biology-greenhouse building,
10 \$250,000; law building, \$200,000; and administration build-
11 ing, \$700,000.

12 OFFICE OF EDUCATION

13 Promotion and further development of vocational educa-
14 tion: For carrying out the provisions of section 3 of the
15 Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20 U. S. C. 15),
16 section 4 of the Act of March 10, 1924 (20 U. S. C. 29),
17 section 1 of the Act of March 3, 1931 (20 U. S. C. 30),
18 and the Act of March 18, 1950 (Public Law 462),
19 \$23,673,261: *Provided*, That the apportionment to the
20 States under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 shall
21 be computed on the basis of not to exceed \$23,498,261 for
22 the current fiscal year: *Provided further*, That not more
23 than \$900,000 of this appropriation shall be available for
24 vocational education in distributive occupations.

25 Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and the

1 mechanic arts: For carrying out the provisions of section
2 22 of the Act of June 29, 1935, as amended, \$2,501,500.

3 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
4 Office of Education, including surveys, studies, investiga-
5 tions, and reports regarding libraries; fostering coordina-
6 tion of public and school library service; coordination of
7 library service on the national level with other forms of
8 adult education; developing library participation in Federal
9 projects; fostering Nation-wide coordination of research
10 materials among libraries, interstate library coordination and
11 the development of library service throughout the country;
12 purchase, distribution, and exchange of educational docu-
13 ments, motion-picture films, and lantern slides; collection,
14 exchange, and cataloging of educational apparatus and appli-
15 ances, articles of school furniture and models of school build-
16 ings illustrative of foreign and domestic systems and methods
17 of education, and repairing the same; \$2,900,000, of which
18 not less than \$480,000 shall be available for the Division
19 of Vocational Education as authorized: *Provided*, That all
20 receipts from non-Federal agencies representing reimburse-
21 ment for expenses of travel of employees of the Office of
22 Education performing advisory functions to the said agencies
23 shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to
24 the credit of this appropriation.

25 Payments to school districts: For payments to local

1 educational agencies for the maintenance and operation of
2 schools as authorized by the Act of September 30, 1950
3 (Public Law 874), as amended, \$55,000,000: *Provided*,
4 That this appropriation shall also be available for carrying
5 out the provisions of section 6 of such Act.

6 Assistance for school construction: For an additional
7 amount for providing school facilities and for grants to local
8 educational agencies in federally affected areas, as author-
9 ized by titles III and IV of the Act of September 23, 1950
10 (Public Law 815), as amended, including not to exceed
11 \$575,000 for necessary expenses of technical services ren-
12 dered by other agencies, \$70,000,000, to remain available
13 until expended, and of which \$12,000,000 shall be available
14 for carrying out title IV of said Act: *Provided*, That no part
15 of this appropriation shall be available for salaries or other
16 direct expenses of the Department of Health, Education,
17 and Welfare: *Provided further*, That the sum of \$125,000
18 made available for "technical services rendered by other
19 agencies" under this head in Public Law 357, 83d Congress,
20 shall remain available through June 30, 1955.

21 OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

22 Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and
23 Puerto Rico): For payments to States (including Alaska,
24 Hawaii, and Puerto Rico) in accordance with the Vocational
25 Rehabilitation Act, as amended (29 U. S. C., ch. 4) in-

cluding payments, in accordance with regulations of the Secretary, for one-half of necessary expenditures for the acquisition of vending stands or other equipment in accordance with section 3 (a) (3) (C) of said Act for the use of blind persons, such stands or other equipment to be controlled by the State agency, \$23,000,000, of which not to exceed \$195,000 shall be available to the Secretary for providing rehabilitation services to disabled residents of the District of Columbia, as authorized by section 6 of said Act, which latter amount shall be available for administrative expenses in connection with providing such services in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That not to exceed 15 per centum of the appropriation shall be used for administrative purposes: *Provided further*, That the funds herein appropriated shall be made available to the States in accordance with the provisions of section 3 (a) of Public Law 113 (Seventy-eighth Congress) approved July 6, 1943.

Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico), next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after May 31, of the current fiscal year, payments to States in accordance with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended (including the objects specified in the preceding paragraph), for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal

1 year such sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred
2 and the expenditures made thereunder to be charged to the
3 appropriation therefor for that fiscal year: *Provided*, That
4 the payments made pursuant to this paragraph shall not
5 exceed the amount paid to the States for the first quarter of
6 the current fiscal year.

7 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary in carry-
8 ing out the provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act,
9 as amended, and of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (20
10 U. S. C., ch. 6A), including not to exceed \$3,000 for pro-
11 duction, purchase, and distribution of educational films;
12 \$620,000.

13 PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

14 For necessary expenses in carrying out the Public Health
15 Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 6A) (herein-
16 after referred to as the Act), and other Acts, including
17 expenses for active commissioned officers in the Reserve
18 Corps and for not to exceed one thousand five hundred com-
19 missioned officers in the Regular Corps, as follows:

20 Assistance to States, general: To carry out the pur-
21 poses, not otherwise specifically provided for, of section 314
22 (c) of the Act; to provide consultative services to States
23 pursuant to section 311 of the Act; to make field investiga-
24 tions and demonstrations pursuant to section 301 of the
25 Act; to provide for collecting and compiling mortality,

1 morbidity, and vital statistics; and not to exceed \$1,000
2 for entertainment of officials of other countries when specifi-
3 cally authorized by the Surgeon General; \$13,000,000, of
4 which not more than \$2,400,000 shall be available for
5 personal services.

6 Venereal diseases: To carry out the purposes of sections
7 314 (a) and 363 of the Act with respect to venereal diseases
8 including the operation and maintenance of centers for the
9 diagnosis and treatment of persons afflicted with venereal
10 diseases; and for grants of money, services, supplies, equip-
11 ment, and use of facilities to States, as defined in the Act,
12 and with the approval of the respective State health author-
13 ities, to counties, health districts, and other political sub-
14 divisions of the States, for the foregoing purposes, in such
15 amounts and upon such terms and conditions as the Surgeon
16 General may determine; \$3,000,000.

17 Tuberculosis: To carry out the purposes of section 314
18 (b) of the Act, \$6,000,000.

19 Communicable diseases: To carry out, except as other-
20 wise provided for, those provisions of sections 301, 311, and
21 361 of the Act relating to the prevention and suppression
22 of communicable and preventable diseases, and the inter-
23 state transmission and spread thereof, including the purchase,
24 erection, and maintenance of portable buildings; and hire,
25 maintenance, and operation of aircraft; \$4,300,000.

1 Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene: For
2 expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary to carry out
3 those provisions of sections 301, 311, 314 (c), and 361 of
4 the Act relating to sanitation and other aspects of environ-
5 mental health, including enforcement of applicable quaran-
6 tine laws and interstate quarantine regulations, and for carry-
7 ing out the purposes of the Water Pollution Control Act (33
8 U. S. C. 466-466 (j)) ; \$3,295,000, of which not less than
9 \$270,000 shall be available only for completing construction
10 of the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center, Cincin-
11 nati, Ohio.

12 Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Ter-
13 ritory of Alaska: To enable the Surgeon General to conduct,
14 in the Service, and to cooperate with and assist the Territory
15 of Alaska in the conduct of, activities necessary in the
16 investigation, prevention, treatment, and control of diseases,
17 and the establishment and maintenance of health and sani-
18 tation services pursuant to and for the purposes specified in
19 sections 301, 311, 314 (without regard to the provisions of
20 subsections (d), (f), (h), and (j) and the limitations set
21 forth in subsection (c) of such section), 361 and 363 of the
22 Act, including the hire, operation, and maintenance of air-
23 craft, and the purchase, erection, and maintenance of port-
24 able buildings, \$1,125,000, of which not less than \$160,000

1 shall be available only for the activation and operation of the
2 two immobilized marine health units "Health" and "Hygiene".

3 Grants for hospital construction: For payments for
4 hospital construction under part C, title VI, of the Act, as
5 amended, to remain available until expended, \$75,000,000:
6 *Provided*, That allotments under such part C to the several
7 States for the current fiscal year shall be made on the basis
8 of an amount equal to the appropriation granted herein.

9 Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services:
10 For salaries and expenses incident to carrying out title VI
11 of the Act, as amended, \$750,000.

12 Hospitals and medical care: For carrying out the func-
13 tions of the Public Health Service under the Act of August
14 8, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 150), and under sections 321, 322, 324,
15 326, 331, 332, 341, 343, 344, 502, 504, and 710 of the
16 Public Health Service Act, and Executive Order 9079 of
17 February 26, 1942, including purchase and exchange of
18 farm products and livestock; conducting research on tech-
19 nical nursing standards and furnishing consultative nursing
20 services; and purchase of firearms and ammunition;
21 \$33,000,000, of which \$1,000,000 shall be exclusively
22 available for payments to the Territory of Hawaii for care
23 and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy: *Provided*,
24 That when the Public Health Service establishes or operates

1 a health service program for any department or agency,
2 payment for the estimated cost shall be made in advance for
3 deposit to the credit of this appropriation.

4 Foreign quarantine service: For carrying out the pur-
5 poses of sections 361 to 369 of the Act, relating to prevent-
6 ing the introduction of communicable diseases from foreign
7 countries, the medical examination of aliens in accordance
8 with section 325 of the Act, and the care and treatment of
9 quarantine detainees pursuant to section 322 (e) of the
10 Act in private or other public hospitals when facilities of
11 the Public Health Service are not available, including in-
12 surance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when
13 required by law of such countries; \$2,900,000.

14 National Institutes of Health, operating expenses: For
15 the activities of the National Institutes of Health, not other-
16 wise provided for, including research fellowships and grants
17 for research projects pursuant to section 301 of the Act; not
18 to exceed \$1,000 for entertainment of visiting scientists when
19 specifically approved by the Surgeon General; erection of
20 temporary structures; and grants of therapeutic and chemical
21 substances for demonstrations and research; \$4,675,000:
22 *Provided*, That the Surgeon General is authorized to advance
23 to this appropriation from other appropriations to the Public
24 Health Service such amounts as are determined to be neces-
25 sary for the foregoing purposes and for activities performed

1 on a centralized basis: *Provided further*, That the Surgeon
2 General is authorized to operate facilities at the National
3 Institutes of Health for the sale of meals to employees and
4 others at rates determined by him to be sufficient to recover
5 the cost of such operation and the proceeds thereof shall be
6 credited to this appropriation.

7 National Cancer Institute: To enable the Surgeon Gen-
8 eral, upon the recommendations of the National Advisory
9 Cancer Council, to make grants-in-aid for research and train-
10 ing projects relating to cancer; to cooperate with State health
11 agencies, and other public and private nonprofit institutions,
12 in the prevention, control, and eradication of cancer by
13 providing consultative services, demonstrations, and grants-
14 in-aid; and to otherwise carry out the provisions of title IV,
15 part A, of the Act; \$21,237,000.

16 Mental health activities: For expenses necessary for
17 carrying out the provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 311,
18 312, and 314 (c) of the Act with respect to mental diseases,
19 \$13,460,000.

20 National Heart Institute: For expenses necessary to
21 carry out the purposes of the National Heart Act,
22 \$16,168,000.

23 Dental health activities: For expenses not otherwise
24 provided for, necessary to enable the Surgeon General to

1 carry out the purposes of the Act with respect to dental
2 diseases and conditions, \$1,740,000.

3 Arthritis and metabolic disease activities: For expenses
4 necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act relating to
5 arthritis, rheumatism, and metabolic diseases, \$7,270,000.

6 Microbiology activities: For expenses necessary to carry
7 out the purposes of the Act relating to microbiology, in-
8 cluding the regulation and preparation of biologic products,
9 \$5,930,000.

10 Neurology and blindness activities: For expenses nec-
11 essary to carry out the purposes of the Act relating to
12 neurology and blindness, \$6,913,000.

13 Gorgas Memorial Laboratory: For payment to the
14 Gorgas Memorial Institute for maintenance and operation
15 of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, \$131,000.

16 Retired pay of commissioned officers: For retired pay
17 of commissioned officers, as authorized by law, and payments
18 under the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of
19 1953, \$1,141,000.

20 Salaries and expenses: For the divisions and offices of
21 the Office of the Surgeon General and for miscellaneous
22 expenses of the Public Health Service not appropriated for
23 elsewhere, including preparing information, articles, and
24 publications related to public health; and conducting studies
25 and demonstrations in public health methods; \$2,780,000.

1 Administrative provisions: During the current fiscal
2 year, and with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget,
3 there may be transferred from any annual appropriation
4 to the Public Health Service to any other such appropria-
5 tion such additional amounts as may be required for pay
6 and allowances of the active commissioned officers herein
7 authorized, but any amounts so transferred shall not exceed
8 5 per centum of any such appropriation and no such appro-
9 priation shall be increased by more than 5 per centum as a
10 result of any such transfers.

11 SAINT ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

12 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
13 maintenance and operation of the hospital, including pur-
14 chase of clothing for patients and cooperation with organiza-
15 tions or individuals in the scientific research into the nature,
16 causes, prevention and treatment of mental illness, \$2,445,-
17 000.

18 Major repairs and preservation of buildings and
19 grounds: For miscellaneous construction, alterations, repairs,
20 and equipment, on the grounds of the hospital, including
21 preparation of plans and specifications, advertising, and
22 supervision of construction, \$709,000: *Provided*, That any
23 part of this amount may be transferred to the General
24 Services Administration.

1 SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

2 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors
3 Insurance: For necessary expenses, including furnishing,
4 repairing, and cleaning of wearing apparel and equipment
5 used by building guards; not more than \$64,150,000 may
6 be expended from the Federal old-age and survivors insur-
7 ance trust fund.

8 Grants to States for public assistance: For grants to
9 States for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid
10 to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled,
11 as authorized in titles I, IV, X, and XIV of the Social
12 Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subchs. I, IV,
13 X, and XIV), \$1,200,000,000, of which such amount as may
14 be necessary shall be available for grants for any period in
15 the prior fiscal year subsequent to March 31 of that year.

16 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance: For
17 expenses necessary for the Bureau of Public Assistance,
18 \$1,450,000.

19 Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau: For necessary
20 expenses in carrying out the Act of April 9, 1912, as
21 amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 6), and title V of the Social
22 Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V),
23 including purchase of reports and material for the publica-
24 tions of the Children's Bureau and of reprints for distribution,
25 \$1,525,000: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation

1 contained in this title shall be used to promulgate or carry
2 out any instructions, order, or regulation relating to the care
3 of obstetrical cases which discriminate between persons
4 licensed under State law to practice obstetrics: *Provided*
5 *further*, That the foregoing proviso shall not be so construed
6 as to prevent any patient from having the services of any
7 practitioner of her own choice, paid for out of this fund, so
8 long as State laws are complied with: *Provided further*,
9 That any State plan which provides standards for professional
10 obstetrical services in accordance with the laws of the State
11 shall be approved.

12 Grants to States for maternal and child welfare: For
13 grants to States for maternal and child-health services, serv-
14 ices for crippled children, and child-welfare services as
15 authorized in title V, parts 1, 2, and 3, of the Social Security
16 Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V), \$30,000,-
17 000: *Provided*, That any allotment to a State pursuant to
18 section 502 (b) or 512 (b) of such Act shall not be included
19 in computing for the purposes of subsections (a) and (b) of
20 sections 504 and 514 of such Act an amount expended or
21 estimated to be expended by the State.

22 Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner: For
23 expenses necessary for the Office of the Commissioner of
24 Social Security, \$173,000, together with not to exceed

1 \$123,500 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and
2 survivors insurance trust fund.

3 Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For mak-
4 ing, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to
5 States under titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV, respectively, of
6 the Social Security Act, as amended, for the first quarter of
7 the next succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may be neces-
8 sary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures made
9 thereunder for payments under each of such titles to be
10 charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year.

11 In the administration of titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV,
12 respectively, of the Social Security Act, as amended, pay-
13 ments to a State under any of such titles for any quarter
14 in the period beginning April 1 of the prior year, and ending
15 June 30 of the current year, may be made with respect to a
16 State plan approved under such title prior to or during such
17 period, but no such payment shall be made with respect to
18 any plan for any quarter prior to the quarter in which such
19 plan was submitted for approval.

20 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

21 Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary: For
22 expenses necessary for the Office of the Secretary, \$1,075,-
23 000, together with not to exceed \$171,000 to be transferred
24 from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund:

1 *Provided*, That not more than \$200,000 additional may be
2 transferred to this head from other appropriations.

3 Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Services: For
4 expenses necessary for the Office of Field Services,
5 including not less than \$850,000 for the Division of Grant-
6 in-Aid Audits, \$1,775,000, together with not to exceed
7 \$350,000 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and
8 survivors insurance trust fund.

9 Salaries and expenses, Office of the General Counsel: For
10 expenses necessary for the Office of the General Counsel,
11 \$350,000, together with not to exceed \$22,500 to be trans-
12 ferred from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, certifi-
13 cation and inspection services", and not to exceed \$365,000
14 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors in-
15 surance trust fund.

16 Surplus property disposal: For expenses necessary for
17 carrying out the provisions of subsections 203 (j) and (k)
18 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act
19 of 1949, as amended, relating to disposal of real and personal
20 excess property for educational purposes and protection of
21 public health, \$400,000.

22 GENERAL PROVISIONS

23 SEC. 202. Appropriations under this title available for
24 salaries and expenses shall be available for payment in

1 advance for dues or fees for library membership in organiza-
2 tions whose publications are available to members only or to
3 members at a price lower than to the general public.

4 SEC. 203. Appropriations under this title available for
5 salaries and expenses shall be available for services as
6 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5
7 U. S. C. 55a).

8 SEC. 204. Appropriations under this title available for
9 salaries and expenses shall be available for travel expenses
10 and not to exceed \$75,000 of such funds shall be avail-
11 able for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with
12 the functions or activities for which such appropriations are
13 made.

14 SEC. 205. None of the funds appropriated by this title
15 to the Social Security Administration for grants in aid of
16 State agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of
17 operation of said agencies including the salaries and expenses
18 of officers and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld
19 from the said agencies of any States which have established
20 by legislative enactment and have in operation a merit sys-
21 tem and classification and compensation plan covering the
22 selection, tenure in office, and compensation of their em-
23 ployees, because of any disapproval of their personnel or
24 the manner of their selection by the agencies of the said
25 States, or the rates of pay of said officers or employees.

1 SEC. 206. The Secretary is authorized to make such
2 transfers of motor vehicles, between bureaus and offices,
3 without transfer of funds, as may be required in carrying
4 out the operations of the Department.

5 This title may be cited as the "Department of Health,
6 Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1955".

7 TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

8 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
9 National Labor Relations Board to carry out the functions
10 vested in it by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947
11 (29 U. S. C. 141-167), and other laws, including expenses
12 of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the
13 Board when specifically authorized by the Chairman or the
14 General Counsel; and services as authorized by section
15 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a);
16 \$8,400,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation
17 shall be available to organize or assist in organizing agricul-
18 tural laborers or used in connection with investigations, hear-
19 ings, directives, or orders concerning bargaining units com-
20 posed of agricultural laborers as referred to in section 2 (3)
21 of the Act of July 5, 1935 (49 Stat. 450), and as amended
22 by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and as
23 defined in section 3 (f) of the Act of June 25, 1938 (52
24 Stat. 1060), and including in said definition employees
25 engaged in the maintenance and operation of ditches, canals,

1 reservoirs, and waterways when maintained or operated on
2 a mutual, nonprofit basis and at least 95 per centum of the
3 water stored or supplied thereby is used for farming pur-
4 poses.

5 This title may be cited as the "National Labor
6 Relations Board Appropriation Act, 1955".

7 TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

8 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
9 National Mediation Board, including stenographic reporting
10 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August
11 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$422,000.

12 Arbitration and emergency boards: For expenses neces-
13 sary for arbitration boards established under section 7 of
14 the Railway Labor Act, as amended (45 U. S. C. 157),
15 and emergency boards appointed by the President pursuant
16 to section 10 of said Act (45 U. S. C. 160), including
17 stenographic reporting services as authorized by section 15
18 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$300,000.

19 NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

20 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
21 National Railroad Adjustment Board, including stenographic
22 reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
23 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$495,000, of which not
24 less than \$175,000 shall be available for compensation (at
25 rates not in excess of \$75 per diem) and expenses of referees

1 appointed pursuant to section 3 of the Railway Labor Act,
2 as amended.

3 This title may be cited as the “National Mediation
4 Board Appropriation Act, 1955”.

5 TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

6 Salaries and expenses, Railroad Retirement Board (trust
7 fund) : For expenses necessary for the Railroad Retirement
8 Board, including not to exceed \$1,000 for expenses of attend-
9 ance at meetings concerned with the work of the Board, when
10 specifically authorized by the Board; and stenographic re-
11 porting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
12 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; \$6,108,000, to be derived
13 from the railroad retirement account.

14 This title may be cited as the “Railroad Retirement Board
15 Appropriation Act, 1955”.

16 TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND 17 CONCILIATION SERVICE

18 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
19 Service to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-
20 Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 171–180,
21 182), including expenses of the Labor-Management Panel
22 as provided in section 205 of said Act; temporary employ-
23 ment of arbitrators, conciliators, and mediators on labor
24 relations at rates not in excess of \$75 per diem; expenses of
25 attendance at meetings concerned with labor and industrial

1 hundred and five, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and
2 intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided,*
3 That for purposes of this section employees shall be con-
4 sidered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time
5 or more in personnel administration consisting of direction
6 and administration of the personnel program; employment,
7 placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification;
8 employee relations and services; training; committees of
9 expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage
10 administration; and processing, recording, and reporting.

11 This Act may be cited as the "Departments of Labor,
12 and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act,
13 1955."

Passed the House of Representatives June 10, 1954.

Attest:

LYLE O. SNADER,

Clerk.

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

JUNE 11, 1954

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Appropriations

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION,
AND WELFARE, AND RELATED INDEPENDENT
AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955

JUNE 22, 1954.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. THYE, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the
following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 9447]

The Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 9447) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, report the same to the Senate with various amendments and present herewith information relative to the changes made:

Amount of bill passed by House.....	\$1, 970, 378, 761
Amount added by Senate (net).....	12, 091, 000
Total of bill as reported to Senate.....	1, 982, 469, 761
Amount of appropriations, 1954.....	2, 251, 189, 261
Amount of the regular estimates, 1955.....	1, 965, 285, 261
The bill as reported to the Senate:	
Under the appropriations for 1954.....	268, 719, 500
Over the estimates for 1955.....	17, 184, 500

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

1954 appropriation.....	\$1, 350, 000
1955 budget estimate.....	1, 355, 000
House allowance.....	1, 300, 000
Committee recommendation.....	1, 354, 000

The committee recommends an additional \$54,000, a decrease of \$1,000 under the budget estimate.

The committee recommends the deletion of the limitation "of which not more than \$60,000 shall be for international labor affairs" and approves the \$54,000 increase for this activity. It is the consensus of the committee that much benefit is derived from this work and merits the support of the Congress.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS

1954 appropriation.....	\$700, 000
1955 budget estimate.....	770, 000
House allowance.....	665, 000
Committee recommendation.....	680, 000

The committee recommends \$680,000, an increase of \$15,000 over the House allowance, but \$90,000 under the estimate and \$20,000 under the 1954 appropriation.

The committee action approves the budget request for funds in connection with international labor activities, \$13,763, for necessary work in connection with the program carried out in the Office of the Secretary.

The committee considered for the second year the Department's request for \$100,000 to inaugurate a program for the study of the problems of migratory workers, denied for the second year by the House. This committee again concurs in the House action.

BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP

1954 appropriation.....	\$3, 230, 000
1955 budget estimate.....	3, 215, 000
House allowance.....	3, 100, 000
Committee recommendation.....	3, 100, 000

The committee considered an appeal from the Department of Labor for restoration of the House cut of \$115,000 under the budget estimate but feels that the House allowance is entirely sufficient to enable the Bureau to adequately perform its functions.

The committee was advised that the House cut would necessitate the reduction of 11 technical and 6 clerical positions. The committee directs that this reduction be applied in such a manner that each State will have at least one representative of the Bureau serving as a field representative.

GRANTS TO STATES FOR UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE ADMINISTRATION, BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

1954 appropriation.....	\$204, 305, 000
Contingency fund.....	18, 100, 000
1955 budget estimate.....	216, 400, 000
Contingency fund.....	6, 000, 000
House allowance.....	216, 400, 000
Contingency fund.....	16, 400, 000
Committee recommendation.....	216, 400, 000
Contingency fund.....	6, 000, 000

The committee has approved the budget estimate allowed by the House, but recommends that only \$6,000,000 of the appropriation be placed in the contingency fund, instead of \$16,400,000 as allowed by the House. The \$10,400,000 will be available as part of the basic grant to be allocated among the several States without limitation to meet the costs of this program.

The committee also recommends the inclusion of the phrase "or salary costs resulting from changes in compensation plans" at the proper place in the appropriation language to permit the use of the contingency fund to meet increased costs of administration resulting from unforeseen increased salary costs.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, MEXICAN FARM LABOR PROGRAM,
BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

1954 appropriation.....	\$1, 728, 000
1955 budget estimate.....	1, 746, 000
House allowance.....	1, 521, 000
Committee recommendation.....	1, 581, 000

The committee recommends \$1,581,000, an increase of \$60,000 over the House allowance, but \$147,000 under the 1954 appropriation, and \$165,000 under the original budget estimate.

The budget estimate presented in January was for \$1,746,000, but after the submission of the budget the Comptroller General ruled, in response to a request from the Hill, that the revolving fund, into which is paid fees by employers using the imported Mexican labor, could be used to pay the essential expenses of requisite physical and medical examinations. The 1955 estimate contained \$229,375 for such examinations, by which the estimate could be reduced as a result of the decision of the Comptroller General.

The extension of the migrant labor agreement between the United States and Mexico, agreed to on March 10, 1954, called for the establishment of an additional reception center at Hidalgo, Tex., adding costs not contemplated in the budget estimate. The Appropriations Committees were later notified by the Department that their 1955 estimate could be amended to \$1,584,000, deleting funds requested for the examinations and adding funds for the Hidalgo center. The funds recommended by this committee will be sufficient to permit the full-time operation of this new center.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

1954 appropriation.....	\$6, 250, 000
1955 budget estimate.....	6, 233, 000
House allowance.....	6, 000, 000
Committee recommendation.....	6, 100, 000

The committee recommends \$6,100,000, an increase of \$100,000 over the House allowance, but \$133,000 under the estimate, and \$250,000 under the 1954 appropriation.

It is felt by the committee that in view of the many years experience under the Fair Labor Standards Act there is substantial compliance with its provisions on the part of employers and that the appropriation recommended is entirely sufficient to enable the Division to perform all requisite complaint investigations and to render necessary informational, educational and service activities to the public and to employers.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

TRANSFER AUTHORITY

SEC. 103. Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation in this title available for salaries and expenses may be transferred to any other such appropriation, but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 5 per centum by any such transfer: Provided, That no such transfer shall be used for creation of new functions within the Department, nor shall the total amount transferred in fiscal year 1955 exceed \$100,000.

The committee recommends the inclusion of the above-cited section in the bill. This transfer authority has been contained in appropriation acts for the Department of Labor for the past 6 years and there is no evidence of misuse. The committee will expect the Department to notify it in advance of the details with respect to each contemplated use of the transfer authority.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

1954 appropriation.....	\$175, 000
1955 budget estimate.....	175, 000
House allowance.....	175, 000
Committee recommendation.....	205, 000

The committee recommends \$205,000, an increase of \$30,000 over the House allowance, and a like increase over the budget estimate and the 1954 appropriation.

The committee recommendation, together with the \$10,000 permanent annual appropriation for this purpose, will make available \$30 per blind pupil attending school. There has been a rather precipitate increase in the number of blind children in school attendance over the past couple years, resulting from a rather recent condition, retrolental fibroplasia. The budget estimate would provide only \$25.88 per pupil, a reduction from \$28.31 in fiscal year 1954 and \$29.17 in fiscal year 1953. The cost of furnishing textbooks has not decreased. The committee was informed that the average cost of textbooks for each child annually varied from a low of \$34 in the first grade to in excess of \$200 in high school.

PAYMENTS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS, OFFICE OF EDUCATION

1954 appropriation.....	\$72, 350, 000
1955 budget estimate.....	58, 500, 000
House allowance.....	55, 000, 000
Committee recommendation.....	58, 500, 000

The committee recommends \$58,500,000, the budget estimate, an increase of \$3,500,000 over the House allowance, but \$13,850,000 under the 1954 appropriation.

The committee recommends the adoption of a proviso as follows:

Provided further, That the 3 per centum deduction provided for in section 3 (c) (1) of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, as amended, shall not take effect for any fiscal year beginning prior to July 1, 1955.

The 3-percent absorption provision was included in Public Law 248, 83d Congress, upon the recommendation of the Office of Education and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, with testimony that such a provision would eliminate 10 percent of eligible school districts. But 600 of 2,528 districts, nearly 25 percent, will be ineligible under section 3 by virtue of this provision. And 522 of the 2,528 districts, in excess of 20 percent, will lose in excess of 50 percent of benefits by this absorption provision, while an additional 578 will lose between 25 and 50 percent. It is the sense of this committee that such a provision imposes an undue hardship upon the school districts and accordingly recommends the suspension of the absorption for 1 year, during which time it is hoped that proper legislative review will be made by the standing committees concerned.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

1954 appropriation.....	\$655, 500
1955 budget estimate.....	650, 000
House allowance.....	620, 000
Committee recommendation.....	650, 000

The committee recommends \$650,000, an increase of \$30,000 over the House allowance, but a decrease of \$5,500 under the 1954 appropriation. The committee recommendation will provide the full budget estimate for 1955.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

SCHOOLING ALLOWANCE FOR DEPENDENTS

The committee recommends the inclusion of the following language in the preamble of the Public Health Service section of the bill:

and expenses for primary and secondary schooling for dependents of personnel of the service stationed outside the continental limits of the United States in amounts not exceeding \$225 per student when the Surgeon General finds that schools available in the locality are unable to provide adequately for the education of such dependents.

This amendment would make provision for the education of children of officers and employees of the Public Health Service similar to that provided for children of officers and employees of the Department of Defense.

TUBERCULOSIS

1954 appropriation.....	\$6, 000, 000
1955 budget estimate.....	3, 500, 000
House allowance.....	6, 000, 000
Committee recommendation.....	6, 000, 000

The committee recommends approval of the House allowance, equal to the 1954 appropriation.

The committee recommends the addition of the following language:

of which not less than \$4,500,000 shall be available only for grants to States, to be matched by an equal amount of State funds expended for the same purpose, for direct expenses of case-finding projects including salaries, fees, and travel of personnel directly engaged in case finding and the necessary equipment and supplies used directly in case-finding operations, but excluding the purchase of care in hospitals and sanatoria.

This amendment would serve to intensify the case-finding activities in the several States, the area requiring the most attention at the present time according to leaders in the tuberculosis control program. The committee notes with satisfaction the drop in mortality from tuberculosis, from 39,100 in 1949 to 19,870 in 1953, and is advised that an intensified case-finding program is needed to further reduce the rate.

DISEASE AND SANITATION INVESTIGATIONS AND CONTROL, TERRITORY OF ALASKA

1954 appropriation.....	\$1, 082, 000
1955 budget estimate.....	1, 062, 000
House allowance.....	1, 125, 000
Committee recommendation.....	1, 125, 000

The committee approves the House allowance, an increase of \$63,000 over the budget estimate, and \$43,000 over the 1954 appropriation.

The committee recommends the deletion of the following language:

of which not less than \$160,000 shall be available only for the activation and operation of the two immobilized marine health units "Health" and "Hygiene" inserted by the House without a budget estimate. The committee is advised that such a provision even with the \$63,000 increase over the estimate would necessitate a cutback in other budgeted operations. Another factor presented to the committee was that there was other inactive equipment which the Territory might prefer to operate.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION SERVICES

1954 appropriation.....	\$875, 000
1955 budget estimate.....	750, 000
House allowance.....	750, 000
Committee recommendation.....	950, 000

The committee recommends an increase of \$200,000 over the House allowance and the original budget estimate, and \$75,000 over the 1954 appropriation.

The original budget estimate was determined on the basis of a hospital construction program of new obligational authority of \$50,000,000. This estimate for grants for hospital construction was revised to \$75,000,000, which necessarily would add to the administrative work. There was presented to the Congress on June 21 an amended estimate for \$950,000 which this committee deems necessary for the proper administration of the program.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

The committee has been privileged to hear full testimony from representatives of the National Institutes of Health and from eminent scientists, physicians and interested laymen not connected with the Federal Government, on research related to diseases covered by the appropriations to the National Institutes of Health.

Upon consideration not only of this testimony but of the general development of medical research in this country, the committee reaffirms what it believes to be the general policy guides upon which decisions on Federal appropriations for this purpose should rest. These are (1) adequate support for promising scientific investigations relating to knowledge of disease which cannot be aided from other sources, and (2) expansion of the national pool of trained medical scientists to permit an expanded medical research effort in the future.

The committee is convinced that the direct economic gains to the Nation—entirely apart from more important human considerations—are such that a further immediate strengthening of the Nation's medical research program is called for at this time. But it must admonish the officials of the National Institutes of Health that a more adequate system of reporting to the committee, and to the Congress, the progress and results of the research program made possible through Federal funds, must be adopted.

The budget estimates for the 8 appropriation accounts in the National Institutes of Health totaled \$71,128,000. The House allowed \$77,393,000, a net increase of \$6,265,000 over the estimates. The committee recommends a total of \$85,143,000, an increase of \$7,750,000 over the House allowance and \$14,015,000 over the budget estimates. Of this increase, the committee allows a total increase of \$420,000 to sustain adequate supporting services, including maintenance of high quality review of grants, at the National Institutes of Health.

The concern of the committee not only with the total dimensions of the Nation's medical research effort, but also with the existence of relatively neglected research areas, is reflected in the allowances for the individual Institutes. In these allowances the committee points out specific areas of investigation in which it wishes to see an intensified effort.

The committee has heard convincing testimony demonstrating that the shortages of scientific manpower may seriously hamper medical research in years to come unless action is taken now to train investigators for the future. The committee wishes the National Institutes of Health to consider how the training of medical scientists can be best promoted at all levels, and how careers for medical scientists can be made more attractive, particularly in the basic sciences related to medicine. The committee wishes the National Institutes of Health to cooperate with the committee staff in preparing a report outlining past and current activities in this field and a program for the future.

The committee has taken a special interest in the Clinical Center, and is gratified that research in progress there is so promising. In particular, the possibility that a means of preventing epilepsy may be in the offing was most encouraging.

The committee trusts that progress toward development of the fully integrated clinical-laboratory research program for which the Clinical Center was constructed will continue.

NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE

1954 appropriation.....	\$20, 237, 000
1955 budget estimate.....	19, 730, 000
House allowance.....	21, 237, 000
Committee recommendation.....	22, 737, 000

The committee recommends an increase of \$1,500,000 over the House allowance and \$3,007,000 over the budget estimate.

The committee heard with interest of the increased activity in the field of cancer chemotherapy permitted by last year's appropriation and expects these activities to continue on a high level. It would appear that ultimate success in this endeavor will require active collaboration among the essential disciplines in the overall effort and instructs the Institute to maintain mechanisms which will facilitate such collaboration as well as free interchange of information among the cooperating scientists.

Emphasis on a practical aspect of the cancer problem by the committee should not be taken to mean that it does not view with equal interest the more fundamental studies supported by the Institute. It appreciates that the ultimate solution to the diseases grouped as cancer can only come from probing the mysteries of cell growth and cell division from a clear understanding of the importance of inheritance versus environment in conditioning the development of these diseases, and from a much clearer understanding of the metabolic processes and their control which are essential for normal cell and organ function.

MENTAL HEALTH ACTIVITIES

1954 appropriation.....	\$12, 095, 000
1955 budget estimate.....	12, 460, 000
House allowance.....	13, 460, 000
Committee recommendation.....	14, 460, 000

The committee recommends an increase of \$1,000,000 over the House allowance and an increase of \$2,000,000 over the budget estimate.

Such an increase recognizes that the ultimate goal sought under these activities can only be achieved by a combination of increased manpower and an increased intensity of research activity. Training is particularly stressed in this appropriation since despite the training program sponsored by this Institute for 7 years, the need for specially trained personnel continues to increase at a rapid rate. The general problem of the mentally ill is so great that it is not possible to satisfy it by Federal action alone and the committee is gratified to learn of increasing activity in these fields by regional associations of States. The committee commends the Institute for its part in stimulating this needed activity.

Research progress in this area is expectedly slow due to the very nature of the problems posed by mental illness and again due to shortages in research talent. However, it is encouraging to note the beginning entrance of diversely trained scientists into these areas and trust such a trend will continue. This latter happening has already permitted the beginning of programs on the causes of mental illness including the role of metabolic and endocrine factors. Seeking an organic cause for certain of the systematic psychoses is a trend in mental health research with exciting possibilities.

NATIONAL HEART INSTITUTE

1954 appropriation.....	\$15, 168, 000
1955 budget estimate.....	14, 570, 000
House allowance.....	16, 168, 000
Committee recommendation.....	17, 168, 000

The committee recommends an increase of \$1,000,000 over the House allowance and \$2,598,000 over the budget estimate.

Cardiovascular disease continues to be the great killer of our times with roughly one of every two people its victim at death. Note is taken, however, that progress against arteriosclerosis, hypertension, and rheumatic fever is being made. Among other things, cardiac surgery is an established reality, a clearer understanding of the processes responsible for arteriosclerosis would appear to be emerging, more effective blood pressure lowering drugs are now available and it is possible to prevent the progress of rheumatic heart disease. Such progress is heartening and warrants continued support on a broad base.

DENTAL HEALTH ACTIVITIES

1954 appropriation.....	\$1, 740, 000
1955 budget estimate.....	1, 730, 000
House allowance.....	1, 740, 000
Committee recommendation.....	1, 990, 000

The committee recommends an increase of \$250,000 over the House allowance, and \$260,000 over the budget estimate. The committee felt that additional research work was fully justified and provides \$200,000 of the increase for this field and \$50,000 for an expanded fellowship program.

ARTHRITIS AND METABOLIC DISEASE ACTIVITIES

1954 appropriation.....	\$7, 000, 000
1955 budget estimate.....	7, 270, 000
House allowance.....	7, 270, 000
Committee recommendation.....	9, 270, 000

The committee recommends an increase of \$2,000,000 over the House allowance and the budget estimate, \$1,750,000 of which is to be applied to research grants and \$250,000 to direct operations for which adequate justification was made to the committee.

The committee was impressed by the rapid developments already apparent in the broad area of this Institute's responsibility. It was equally impressed by the fundamental nature of the approaches which characterize the research programs in both the grant area and their direct operation.

In the field of metabolism, broad interrelations of the many hormones become more clear as do their effect on chemical activities within the cell. It would appear to be of particular importance to expand studies on diabetes and related metabolic disorders on a fundamental as well as a clinical basis. A clarification of the underlying relationships between metabolic mechanisms, the endocrines and the clinical states commonly grouped together under the term "diabetes" would appear to be needed. Related to the arthritis problem, progress ranges from better laboratory diagnosis to improved treatment.

MICROBIOLOGY ACTIVITIES

1954 appropriation.....	\$5, 738, 000
1955 budget estimate.....	5, 930, 000
House allowance.....	5, 930, 000
Committee recommendation.....	6, 430, 000

The committee recommends an increase of \$500,000 over the House allowance and the budget estimate, of which \$90,000 shall be available for direct research, the details of which were fully justified before the committee, and the balance for research grants.

Despite the many advances in the treatment of infectious diseases and despite the lowering of mortality due to them, they still constitute the most common cause of illness. Of particular importance are the diseases grouped under the common cold and related upper respiratory diseases and infectious diseases of childhood. Research in the former of these two areas is being pursued with greater intensity due to the availability of a new technique, tissue culture, which aids in the isolation and growth of the viruses which cause these infections. The committee hopes that such new leads will be pursued vigorously to the extent that funds and facilities permit.

NEUROLOGY AND BLINDNESS ACTIVITIES

1954 appropriation.....	\$4, 500, 000
1955 budget estimate.....	4, 763, 000
House allowance.....	6, 913, 000
Committee recommendation.....	8, 413, 000

The committee recommends an increase of \$1,500,000 over the House allowance and \$3,650,000 over the budget estimate. Of the increase here recommended \$1,000,000 shall be available for expanded research and \$500,000 for training activities.

The increases recommended by this committee, if agreed to by the House, would for the first time permit a serious approach to problems posed by cerebral palsy, multiple sclerosis, muscular dystrophy and other related neuromuscular diseases. It would permit the development of a program in diseases of blindness in the Institute's direct operation to supplement activities in the extramural program and it would permit the Institute to press to a definite conclusion the striking work on epilepsy reported to this committee. The committee realizes that the fields of responsibility are broad and commends the Institute for progress already accomplished.

The increase applied to the training area should permit the progressive development of a sound program. It appreciates that as in mental health, the care of the ill, the instruction of our physicians and pursuit of research are all seriously handicapped by the shortage of trained personnel.

GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF RESEARCH FACILITIES

The committee received numerous requests, urgently presented, for appropriations for grants for construction of research facilities, and gave considerable attention and thought to the requests.

The committee urges the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to investigate this problem to determine the public policy. If such a program is adopted it is the view of this committee that it should be put on a matching basis and the grants be authorized according to formula.

ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

MAJOR REPAIRS AND PRESERVATION OF BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

1954 appropriation-----	\$399, 500
1955 budget estimate-----	709, 000
House allowance-----	709, 000
Committee recommendation-----	709, 000

The committee recommends approval of the House allowance, the amount of the budget estimate.

The committee has added a proviso as follows:

Provided further, That the services financed by this appropriation shall be included in the term "care" as used in section 2 of the Act of August 4, 1947 (24 U. S. C. 168a).

This amendment by including the services performed through the use of this appropriation in the term "care" will prorate this cost among the executive agencies, including the District of Columbia, the appropriation being credited with the payments.

CONSTRUCTION, MAXIMUM SECURITY BUILDING

1954 appropriation-----	0
1955 budget estimate-----	0
House allowance-----	0
Committee recommendation-----	\$110, 000

The committee recommends \$110,000 to begin plans and specifications for the construction of a maximum security building at St. Elizabeths Hospital.

Last year the committee considered an estimate in the amount of \$195,000 for this purpose but denied it, as did the House committee, with instructions to the Department as follows:

The committee will expect the officials of St. Elizabeths Hospital to begin negotiations with the agencies, for whose patients care is furnished on a reimbursable basis, to effect some cooperative arrangement for the construction of this building for which there is a vital need.

The amendment recommended will assess the District of Columbia with a proportionate part of the depreciation costs. payments to be made into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury, over a period of not to exceed 40 years, with respect to all construction hereafter authorized.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS
INSURANCE

1954 appropriation-----	\$63, 746, 000
1954 budget estimate-----	65, 150, 000
House allowance-----	64, 150, 000
Committee recommendation-----	64, 650, 000

The committee recommends \$64,650,000, an increase of \$500,000 over the House allowance, but \$500,000 under the budget estimate.

The committee has specifically disallowed the \$150,000 requested for research and development work on electronic equipment because other than the OASI program was involved in the proposed use of the funds, and no arrangement was made to prorate the cost between the trust fund and the other program.

GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

1954 appropriation.....	\$1, 398, 000, 000
1955 budget estimate.....	1, 200, 000, 000
House allowance.....	1, 200, 000, 000
Committee recommendation.....	1, 200, 000, 000

The committee recommends approval of the House allowance, the budget estimate, but \$198 million below the 1954 appropriation. The reduced budget estimate was attributable to the expiration date of the so-called McFarland amendment on September 30, 1954. But the social-security amendments of 1954, recently passed by the House, continues this amendment for 1 year, and, if enacted, will require a supplemental appropriation.

The committee recommends the inclusion of the following proviso:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for payments to a State under titles I, IV, and X for administration of the State plan in excess of 7 per centum of the Federal share of assistance payments under each such plan.

The variance in the percentage of administrative costs in relation to the Federal share of assistance payments among the several States was called to the committee's attention during consideration of the third supplemental appropriations bill, 1954, and the committee while restoring a House cut and striking out restrictive language promised to reconsider the item in the regular 1955 bill. The national average for calendar year 1953 of the percentage relationship between the Federal share of administrative costs and the Federal share of assistance payments, in the old-age assistance program, was 5.3 percent, ranging from 2.4 percent in Texas, to 14.1 percent in New York.

The limitation recommended by the committee is 1.7 percent over the average for 1953 and should be sufficient to enable each and every State to adequately administer the public-assistance program.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

1954 appropriation.....	\$1, 550, 000
1955 budget estimate.....	1, 550, 000
House allowance.....	1, 450, 000
Committee recommendation.....	1, 550, 000

The committee recommends \$1,550,000, an increase of \$100,000 over the House allowance, but an amount equal to the budget estimate and the 1954 appropriation.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1954 appropriation.....	\$1, 150, 000
OASI transfer.....	171, 000
1955 budget estimate.....	1, 150, 000
OASI transfer.....	171, 000
House allowance.....	1, 075, 000
OASI transfer.....	171, 000
Committee recommendation.....	1, 150, 000
OASI transfer.....	171, 000

The committee recommends the budget estimate, an increase of \$75,000 over the House allowance.

The committee recommends striking of the limitation making no more than \$200,000 additional available to the Office of the Secretary by transfer from other appropriations.

The committee agrees with the House committee in its criticism of the Department for financing the establishment and maintenance of centralized activities in the Office of the Secretary without first presenting such proposals for consideration by the Congress. The language proposed by the House, however, fails to accomplish this objective, but in effect grants authority to the Department, which it did not previously have, to transfer to this appropriation \$200,000 for such activities, and leaves unrestricted authority for the Department to enter into intradepartmental financial transactions provided for by section 601 of the act of June 30, 1952, as amended, or section 7 of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953.

The increase of \$75,000, restoring the appropriation to the amount of the estimate, will enable the Office of the Secretary to operate in accordance with the budget as presented to the committee.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF FIELD SERVICES

1954 appropriation-----	\$1, 835, 000
OASI transfer-----	375, 000
1955 budget estimate-----	1, 935, 000
OASI transfer-----	375, 000
House allowance-----	1, 775, 000
OASI transfer-----	350, 000
Committee recommendation-----	1, 835, 000
OASI transfer-----	350, 000

The committee recommends an increase of \$60,000 in the appropriation over the House allowance, allowing \$1,835,000 in the appropriation and \$350,000 in the transfer from the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, a net reduction below the estimate of \$125,000, and \$25,000 below the funds available in 1954.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

Working capital fund: The working capital fund established in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1953 (66 Stat. 369), shall be available for financing the additional functions of central accounting service and central internal audit service.

The committee recommends the inclusion of this item in the bill. The present language limits the centralized operation to reproduction, tabulating, and supply. The Department desires to include in this authority a central accounting and internal audit service. The Comptroller General, in a letter to the committee, concurs in the desirability of centralizing such functions in the Office of the Secretary in order to efficiently and economically institute normal standards of sound accounting practice and to meet the requirements of the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950. A review of the accounting practices in the Department by the General Accounting Office found them to be generally unsatisfactory. It is the belief of the committee that the recommended authority is a proper method of financing such improvements.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

TRAVEL EXPENSES

The committee recommends an increase in the limitation on funds to be available for travel expenses for attendance at meetings, from \$75,000 to \$105,000, including a specific allowance of \$45,000 for the National Institutes of Health, leaving \$60,000 for the other offices, approximately the same amount as is available during the current year. Information furnished the committee indicated that scientific personnel of the Institutes have paid their own expenses to the extent of \$33,000 this fiscal year for this purpose, a necessary adjunct to scientific investigations and medical research.

TRANSFER AUTHORITY

SEC 207. In order to more effectively administer the programs and functions of the Department, the Secretary is authorized to transfer not to exceed 1 per centum of any appropriation in this title available for salaries and expenses to any other such appropriation but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 1 per centum by any such transfer: Provided, That no such transfers shall be used for the creation of new functions within the Department, nor shall the total amount transferred in fiscal year 1955 exceed \$100,000.

The committee recommends the inclusion of the above-cited section in the bill, giving very limited transfer authority to the Department for the first time.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1954 appropriation.....	\$429, 000
1955 budget estimate.....	436, 000
House allowance.....	422, 000
Committee recommendation.....	429, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$429,000, an increase of \$7,000 over the House allowance, but \$7,000 under the budget estimate.

The committee recommendation of an amount equal to the current year's appropriation should enable the Board to adequately perform its duties.

PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS, GENERAL AND SPECIAL FUNDS

Agency and item	Appropriated, 1954	Estimates, 1955	Increase (+), decrease (-)
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE			
Office of Education:			
Payments to States and Territories for colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts (act of Mar. 4, 1907)	\$2,550,000	\$2,550,000	-----
Payments to States for promotion of vocational education (act of Feb. 23, 1917)	7,138,331	7,138,331	-----
Total, Office of Education	9,688,331	9,688,331	-----
Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	9,688,331	9,688,331	-----
RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD			
Railroad retirement account (military service credits)	34,852,000	-----	-\$34,852,000
Total permanent appropriations, all agencies	44,540,331	9,688,331	-\$34,852,000

TRUST FUNDS

[Not a charge against general revenue]

Agency and item	Appropriated, 1954	Estimates, 1955	Increase (+), decrease (—)
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR			
Bureau of Employees' Compensation:			
Relief and rehabilitation, Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended.....	\$40,000	\$40,000	-----
Relief and rehabilitation, Workmen's Compensation Act, within the District of Columbia.....	5,000	5,000	-----
Bureau of Labor Statistics: Special statistical work.....	71,500	9,500	—\$62,000
Total, Department of Labor.....	116,500	54,500	—62,000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE			
Freedmen's Hospital conditional gift fund.....	627	-----	—627
Public Health Service:			
Patients' benefit fund, Public Health Service hospitals.....	1,000	1,000	-----
Public Health Service conditional gift fund.....	47,900	24,650	—23,250
Public Health Service unconditional gift fund.....	28,500	27,500	—1,000
St. Elizabeths Hospital patients' benefit fund.....	100	100	-----
Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.....	78,127	53,250	—24,877
RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD			
Railroad retirement account.....	772,452,000	744,900,000	—27,552,000
Railroad Unemployment Insurance Administration fund.....	10,000,000	10,000,000	-----
Total, Railroad Retirement Board.....	782,452,000	754,900,000	—27,552,000
Total trust funds, all agencies.....	782,646,627	755,007,750	—27,638,877

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1954, ESTIMATES FOR 1955, AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1955

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1954	Estimates, 1955	House allowance	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (—), Senate bill compared with—	
					Appropriations, 1954	Estimates, 1955
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY						
Salaries and expenses.....	\$1,350,000	\$1,355,000	\$1,300,000	\$1,354,000	+\$4,000	-\$1,000
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR						
Salaries and expenses.....	1,475,000	1,482,000	1,450,000	1,450,000	-25,000	-32,000
BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS						
Salaries and expenses.....	700,000	770,000	665,000	680,000	-20,000	-90,000
BUREAU OF VETERANS' REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS						
Salaries and expenses.....	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000		
BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP						
Salaries and expenses.....	3,230,000	3,215,000	3,100,000	3,100,000	-130,000	-115,000
BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY						
Salaries and expenses.....	5,300,000	4,760,000	4,650,000	4,650,000	-650,000	-110,000
Grants to States.....	204,305,000	216,400,000	216,400,000	216,400,000	+12,095,000	
Unemployment compensation for veterans.....	77,900,000	55,600,000	55,600,000	55,600,000	-22,300,000	
Mexican farm labor program.....	1,728,000	1,746,000	1,521,000	1,581,000	-147,000	-165,000
Total, Bureau of Employment Security.....	280,233,000	278,566,000	278,171,000	278,231,000	-11,062,000	-275,000

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1954, estimates for 1955, and amounts recommended in the bill for 1955—Con.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR—Continued

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1954	Estimates, 1955	House allowance	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (—), Senate bill compared with—		
					Appropriations, 1954	Estimates, 1955	House bill
BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION							
Salaries and expenses.....	\$2,000,000	\$2,030,000	\$2,030,000	\$2,030,000	+\$30,000	-----	
Employees' compensation fund (indefinite).....	[40,300,000]	[41,000,000]	[41,000,000]	[41,000,000]	[+700,000]	-----	
BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS							
Salaries and expenses.....	5,345,000	5,396,000	5,350,000	5,350,000	+5,000	-----	
WOMEN'S BUREAU							
Salaries and expenses.....	350,000	348,000	348,000	348,000	—2,000	-----	
WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION							
Salaries and expenses.....	6,250,000	6,233,000	6,000,000	6,100,000	—150,000	-----	
Total Title I, Department of Labor.....	310,233,000	299,635,000	298,714,000	298,943,000	—11,290,000	-----	
					—133,000	+\$100,000	
					—692,000	+229,000	

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND						
Education of the blind.....	\$175,000	\$175,000	\$175,000	\$235,000	+\$30,000	+\$30,000
COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF						
Salaries and expenses.....	410,000	410,000	410,000	410,000		
Construction of buildings.....	41,000	240,000	259,000	259,000	+218,000	+19,000
Total, Columbia Institution for the Deaf.....	451,000	650,000	669,000	669,000	+218,000	+19,000

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION					
Salaries and expenses (general).....	5,200,000	5,200,000	5,100,000	5,100,000	-100,000
Salaries and expenses (certification and inspection services).....	[1,045,000]	[1,045,000]	[1,045,000]	[1,045,000]	[1,045,000]
FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL					
Salaries and expenses.....	3,104,000	2,880,000	2,880,000	2,880,000	-224,000
HOWARD UNIVERSITY					
Salaries and expenses.....	2,535,000	2,520,000	2,720,000	2,720,000	+200,000
Construction of buildings.....	20,000	4,708,000	4,808,000	4,808,000	+100,000
Liquidation of contract authority.....		250,000	1,150,000	1,150,000	+900,000
Total, Howard University.....	2,555,000	7,478,000	8,678,000	8,678,000	+1,200,000
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Promotion and further development of vocational education.....	18,673,261	18,673,261	23,673,261	23,673,261	+5,000,000
Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts.....	2,501,500	2,501,500	2,501,500	2,501,500	-300,000
Salaries and expenses.....	2,900,000	2,900,000	2,900,000	2,900,000	-13,850,000
Payments to school districts.....	72,350,000	58,500,000	55,000,000	58,500,000	+3,500,000
School construction.....	55,000,000				-55,000,000
Assistance for school construction.....	70,000,000	74,000,000	70,000,000	70,000,000	-4,000,000
Total, Office of Education.....	221,424,761	156,874,761	154,074,761	157,574,761	+3,500,000
OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION					
Payments to States.....	23,000,000	19,175,000	23,000,000	23,000,000	+3,825,000
Salaries and expenses.....	655,500	650,000	620,000	650,000	+30,000
Total, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.....	23,655,500	19,825,000	23,620,000	23,650,000	+3,825,000

¹Includes \$1,173,261 in H. Doc. 386.

²Includes \$100,000 in H. Doc. 393.

³Includes \$34,000,000 in H. Doc. 393.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1954, estimates for 1955, and amounts recommended in the bill for 1955—Con.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1954	Estimates, 1955	House allowance	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (—), Senate bill compared with—		
					Appropriations, 1954	Estimates, 1955	House bill
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE							
Assistance to States, general.....	\$13, 250, 000	\$17, 665, 500	\$13, 000, 000	\$13, 000, 000	—\$250, 000	—\$4, 665, 500	
Venereal diseases.....	5, 000, 000	2, 300, 000	3, 000, 000	3, 000, 000	—2, 000, 000	+700, 000	
Tuberculosis.....	6, 000, 000	3, 500, 000	6, 000, 000	6, 000, 000		+2, 500, 000	
Communicable diseases.....	5, 000, 000	4, 397, 000	4, 300, 000	4, 300, 000	—700, 000	—97, 000	
Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene.....	3, 162, 500	3, 295, 000	3, 295, 000	3, 295, 000	+132, 500		
Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Territory of Alaska.....	1, 082, 000	1, 062, 000	1, 125, 000	1, 125, 000	+43, 000	+63, 000	
Grants for hospital construction.....	65, 000, 000	\$ 75, 000, 000	75, 000, 000	75, 000, 000	+10, 000, 000		
Grants for hospital construction (liquidation of contract authority).....	19, 700, 000				—19, 700, 000		+200, 000
Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services.....	875, 000	750, 000	750, 000	950, 000	+75, 000	+200, 000	
Hospitals and medical care.....	33, 100, 000	33, 040, 000	33, 000, 000	33, 000, 000	—100, 000	—40, 000	
Foreign quarantine service.....	2, 900, 000	2, 900, 000	2, 900, 000	2, 900, 000			
National Institutes of Health:							
Operating expenses.....	4, 675, 000	4, 675, 000	4, 675, 000	4, 675, 000			
National Cancer Institute.....	20, 237, 000	19, 730, 000	21, 237, 000	22, 737, 000	+2, 500, 000	+3, 007, 000	+\$1, 500, 000
Mental health activities.....	12, 095, 000	12, 460, 000	13, 460, 000	14, 460, 000	+2, 365, 000	+2, 000, 000	+1, 000, 000
National Heart Institute.....	15, 168, 000	14, 570, 000	16, 168, 000	17, 168, 000	+2, 000, 000	+2, 598, 000	+1, 000, 000
Dental health activities.....	1, 740, 000	1, 730, 000	1, 740, 000	1, 990, 000	+250, 000	+260, 000	+250, 000

Arthritis and metabolic disease activities.....	7, 000, 000	7, 270, 000	7, 270, 000	9, 270, 000	+2, 270, 000	+2, 000, 000	+2, 000, 000
Microbiology activities.....	5, 738, 000	5, 930, 000	5, 930, 000	6, 430, 000	+692, 000	+500, 000	+500, 000
Neurology and blindness activities.....	4, 500, 000	4, 763, 000	6, 913, 000	8, 413, 000	+3, 913, 000	+3, 650, 000	+1, 500, 000
Subtotal, National Institutes of Health.....	71, 153, 000	71, 128, 000	77, 393, 000	85, 143, 000	+13, 990, 000	+14, 015, 000	+7, 750, 000
Gorgas Memorial Laboratory.....	143, 000	131, 000	131, 000	131, 000	-12, 000	-----	-----
Retired pay of commissioned officers.....	1, 197, 000	1, 141, 000	1, 141, 000	1, 141, 000	-56, 000	-----	-----
Salaries and expenses.....	2, 900, 000	2, 780, 000	2, 780, 000	2, 780, 000	-120, 000	-----	-----
Construction of research facilities (liquidation of contract authorization).....	2, 500, 000	-----	-----	-----	-2, 500, 000	-----	-----
Total, Public Health Service.....	232, 962, 500	219, 089, 500	223, 815, 000	231, 755, 000	-1, 197, 500	+12, 675, 500	+7, 950, 000
ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL							
Salaries and expenses.....	2, 417, 000	2, 445, 000	2, 445, 000	2, 445, 000	+28, 000	-----	-----
Major repairs and preservation of buildings and grounds.....	399, 500	709, 000	709, 000	709, 000	+309, 500	-----	-----
Construction, maximum security building.....	-----	-----	-----	110, 000	+110, 000	+110, 000	+110, 000
Total, St. Elizabeths Hospital.....	2, 816, 500	3, 154, 000	3, 154, 000	3, 264, 000	+417, 500	+110, 000	+110, 000
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION							
Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance.....	[63, 746, 000]	[65, 150, 000]	[64, 150, 000]	[64, 650, 000]	[+904, 000]	[-500, 000]	[+500, 000]
Construction, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance.....	[1, 500, 000]	-----	-----	-----	[-1, 500, 000]	-----	-----
Grants to States for public assistance.....	1, 398, 000, 000	1, 200, 000, 000	1, 200, 000, 000	1, 200, 000, 000	-198, 000, 000	-----	-----
Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance.....	1, 550, 000	1, 550, 000	1, 450, 000	1, 550, 000	-----	-----	+100, 000
Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau.....	1, 525, 000	1, 525, 000	1, 525, 000	1, 525, 000	-----	-----	-----
Grants to States for maternal and child welfare.....	30, 000, 000	30, 000, 000	30, 000, 000	30, 000, 000	-----	-----	-----
Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner:	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Appropriation.....	173, 000	173, 000	173, 000	173, 000	-----	-----	-----
Transfer from OASI.....	[123, 500]	[123, 500]	[123, 500]	[123, 500]	-----	-----	-----
Operating fund, Bureau of Federal Credit Unions.....	250, 000	-----	-----	-----	-250, 000	-----	-----
Total, Social Security Administration.....	1, 431, 498, 000	1, 233, 248, 000	1, 233, 148, 000	1, 233, 248, 000	-198, 250, 000	-----	+100, 000

⁴ Includes \$2,626,500 in H. Doc. 386.

⁵ Includes \$25,000,000 in H. Doc. 386.

TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Salaries and expenses-----	\$429,000	\$436,000	\$422,000	\$429,000	-----	-\$7,000	+\$7,000
Arbitration and emergency boards-----	263,000	330,000	300,000	300,000	+\$37,000	-30,000	-----
National Railroad Adjustment Board, salaries and expenses-----	497,000	495,000	495,000	495,000	-2,000	-----	-----
Total, National Mediation Board-----	1,189,000	1,261,000	1,217,000	1,224,000	+\$35,000	-37,000	+\$7,000

TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Salaries and expenses (trust fund limitation)-----	[\$6,207,000]	[\$6,108,000]	[\$6,108,000]	[\$6,108,000]	[-\$99,000]	-----	-----
--	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	-------------	-------	-------

TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

Salaries and expenses-----	\$3,200,000	\$3,170,000	\$3,124,000	\$3,124,000	-\$76,000	-\$46,000	-----
Boards of inquiry-----	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	-----	-----	-----
Total, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service-----	3,210,000	3,180,000	3,134,000	3,134,000	-76,000	-46,000	-----
Grand total, all titles of bill-----	2,251,189,261	1,965,285,261	1,970,378,761	1,982,439,761	-268,719,500	+17,184,500	+\$12,091,000

○

Calendar No. 1637

83^D CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 9447

[Report No. 1623]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 11, 1954

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

JUNE 22, 1954

Reported by Mr. THYE, with amendments

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Depart-
5 ments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and
6 related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending
7 June 30, 1955, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Secretary of Labor (hereafter in this title referred to as the Secretary), including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); teletype news service; and payment in advance when authorized by the Secretary for dues or fees for library membership in organizations whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public; ~~\$1,300,000~~ \$1,354,000, of which not more than \$60,000 shall be for international labor affairs.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Solicitor, \$1,450,000.

BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the promotion of industrial safety, employment stabilization, and amicable industrial relations for labor and industry; performance of safety functions of the Secretary under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (5 U. S. C. 784 (c)); performance of the functions vested in the Secretary by title I of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 159 (f) and (g)); and not less than

1 \$75,000 for the work of the President's Committee on Na-
2 tional Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, as au-
3 thorized by the Act of July 11, 1949 (63 Stat. 409) and
4 provided further that no part of the appropriation for the
5 President's Committee shall be subject to reduction or trans-
6 fer to any other department or agency under the provisions
7 of any existing law; including purchase of reports and of
8 material for informational exhibits and expenses of attendance
9 of cooperating officials and consultants at conferences con-
10 cerned with the work of the Bureau of Labor Standards;
11 ~~\$665,000~~ \$680,000.

12 BUREAU OF VETERANS' REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS

13 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to
14 render assistance in connection with the exercise of re-
15 employment rights under section 8 of the Selective Training
16 and Service Act of 1940, as amended (50 U. S. C. App.
17 308), the Service Extension Act of 1941, as amended, the
18 Army Reserve and Retired Personnel Service Law of 1940,
19 as amended, and section 9 of the Universal Military Train-
20 ing and Service Act, and, under the Act of June 23, 1943,
21 as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 1472), of persons who have
22 performed service in the Merchant Marine, \$300,000.

1 BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP

2 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to en-
3 able the Secretary to conduct a program of encouraging
4 apprentice training as authorized by the Act of August 16,
5 1937 (29 U. S. C. 50) , \$3,100,000.

6 BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

7 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
8 general administration of the employment service and unem-
9 ployment compensation programs, including temporary em-
10 ployment of persons, without regard to the civil-service laws,
11 for the farm placement migratory labor program; and not
12 to exceed \$10,000 for services as authorized by section 15
13 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; \$4,650,000,
14 of which \$1,100,000 ~~shall~~ *may* be for carrying into effect the
15 provisions of title IV (except section 602) of the Service-
16 men's Readjustment Act of 1944.

17 Grants to States for unemployment compensation and
18 employment service administration: For grants in accord-
19 ance with the provisions of the Act of June 6, 1933, as
20 amended (29 U. S. C. 49-49n) , for carrying into effect
21 section 602 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944,
22 for grants to the States as authorized in title III of the Social
23 Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 501-503) , including,
24 upon the request of any State, the purchase of equipment,
25 and the payment of rental for space made available to

1 such State in lieu of grants for such purpose, for nec-
2 essary expenses in connection with the operation of em-
3 ployment office facilities and services in the District of
4 Columbia, and for expenses not otherwise provided for,
5 necessary for carrying out title IV of the Veterans' Readjust-
6 ment Assistance Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 684), \$216,-
7 400,000, of which ~~\$16,400,000~~ \$6,000,000 shall be available
8 only to the extent that the Secretary finds necessary to meet
9 increased costs of administration resulting from changes
10 in a State law or increases in the numbers of claims
11 filed and claims paid *or salary costs resulting from changes*
12 *in compensation plans* over those upon which the State's
13 basic grant (or the allocation for the District of Columbia)
14 was based, which increased costs of administration cannot
15 be provided for by normal budgetary adjustments: *Provided,*
16 That notwithstanding any provision to the contrary in section
17 302 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended, the Secre-
18 tary of Labor shall from time to time certify to the Secretary
19 of the Treasury for payment to each State found to be in
20 compliance with the requirements of the Act of June 6, 1933,
21 and, except in the case of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands,
22 with the provisions of section 303 of the Social Security Act,
23 as amended, such amounts as he determines to be necessary
24 for the proper and efficient administration of its unemploy-
25 ment compensation law and of its public employment offices:

1 *Provided further*, That such amounts as may be agreed upon
2 by the Department of Labor and the Post Office Department
3 shall be used for the payment, in such manner as said parties
4 may jointly determine, of postage for the transmission of
5 official mail matter in connection with the administration of
6 unemployment compensation systems and employment serv-
7 ices by States receiving grants herefrom.

8 In carrying out the provisions of said Act of June 6,
9 1933, the provisions of section 303 (a) (1) of the Social
10 Security Act, as amended, relating to the establishment and
11 maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, shall
12 apply.

13 None of the funds appropriated by this title to the
14 Bureau of Employment Security for grants-in-aid of State
15 agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of operation
16 of said agencies including the salaries and expenses of officers
17 and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld from the
18 said agencies of any States which have established by legis-
19 lative enactment and have in operation a merit system and
20 classification and compensation plan covering the selection,
21 tenure in office, and compensation of their employees, be-
22 cause of any disapproval of their personnel or the manner
23 of their selection by the agencies of the said States, or the
24 rates of pay of said officers or employees.

1 Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For mak-
2 ing, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to
3 States under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended,
4 and under the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended, for the first
5 quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may
6 be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures
7 made thereunder for payments under such title and under
8 such Act of June 6, 1933, to be charged to the appropriation
9 therefor for that fiscal year.

10 Unemployment compensation for veterans: For pay-
11 ments to unemployed veterans as authorized by title IV of
12 the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952,
13 \$55,600,000.

14 Unemployment compensation for veterans, next succeed-
15 ing fiscal year: For making, after May 31 of the current
16 fiscal year, payments to States, as authorized by title IV
17 of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, such
18 sums as may be necessary to pay benefits for the first quarter
19 of the next succeeding fiscal year, and the obligations and
20 expenditures thereunder shall be charged to the appropria-
21 tion therefor for that fiscal year.

22 Salaries and expenses, Mexican farm labor program:
23 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to
24 carry out the functions of the Department of Labor under

1 the Act of July 12, 1951 (Public Law 78), as amended,
2 including temporary employment of persons without regard
3 to the civil service laws, ~~\$1,521,000~~ \$1,581,000.

4 BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION

5 Salaries and expenses: For necessary administrative
6 expenses and not to exceed \$112,000 for the Employees'
7 Compensation Appeals Board, \$2,030,000, together with
8 not to exceed \$90,000 to be derived from the War Claims
9 Fund created by section 13 (a) of the War Claims Act
10 of 1948 (50 U. S. C. 2012).

11 Employees' compensation fund: For the payment of
12 compensation and other benefits and expenses (except ad-
13 ministrative expenses) authorized by law and accruing dur-
14 ing the current or any prior fiscal year, including payments
15 to other Federal agencies for medical and hospital services
16 pursuant to agreement approved by the Bureau of Employ-
17 ees' Compensation; continuation of payment of benefits as
18 provided for under the head "Civilian War Benefits" in the
19 Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1947; the
20 advancement of costs for enforcement of recoveries in third-
21 party cases; the furnishing of medical and hospital services
22 and supplies, treatment, and funeral and burial expenses,
23 including transportation and other expenses incidental to

1 such services, treatment, and burial, for such enrollees of the
2 Civilian Conservation Corps as were certified by the Director
3 of such Corps as receiving hospital services and treatment
4 at Government expense on June 30, 1943, and who are
5 not otherwise entitled thereto as civilian employees of the
6 United States, and the limitations and authority of the Act
7 of September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U. S. C. 796), shall
8 apply in providing such services, treatment, and expenses in
9 such cases; such amount as may be required during the
10 current fiscal year: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall
11 be available for payments pursuant to sections 4 (c) and
12 5 (f) of the War Claims Act of 1948 (50 U. S. C. 2012)
13 and shall be credited with advances or reimbursements there-
14 for from the War Claims Fund created by section 13 (a)
15 of said War Claims Act of 1948.

16 BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

17 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
18 work of the Bureau, including advances or reimbursement
19 to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees
20 for services rendered, and not to exceed \$15,000 for serv-
21 ices as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,
22 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$5,350,000.

1 WOMEN'S BUREAU

2 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
3 work of the Women's Bureau, as authorized by the Act of
4 June 5, 1920 (29 U. S. C. 11-16), including purchase of
5 reports and material for informational exhibits, \$348,000.

6 WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

7 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for per-
8 forming the duties imposed by the Fair Labor Standards
9 Act of 1938, as amended, and the Act to provide conditions
10 for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by
11 the United States, approved June 30, 1936, as amended
12 (41 U. S. C. 35-45), including reimbursement to State,
13 Federal, and local agencies and their employees for inspec-
14 tion services rendered, and not to exceed \$3,000 for ex-
15 penses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants
16 at conferences concerned with the work of the Division,
17 ~~\$6,000,000~~ \$6,100,000.

18 GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 102. Appropriations under this title available for salaries and expenses shall be available for stenographic reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the function or activity for which any such appropriation is made.

25 *SEC. 103. Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appro-*

1 *priation in this title available for salaries and expenses may*
 2 *be transferred to any other such appropriation, but no such*
 3 *appropriation shall be increased by more than 5 per centum*
 4 *by any such transfer: Provided, That no such transfer shall*
 5 *be used for creation of new fuunctions within the Department,*
 6 *nor shall the total amount transferred in fiscal year 1955*
 7 *exceed \$100,000.*

8 This title may be cited as the "Department of Labor
 9 Appropriation Act, 1955".

10 TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCA- 11 TION, AND WELFARE

12 AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

13 Education of the blind: For carrying out the Act of
 14 August 4, 1919, as amended (20 U. S. C. 101), ~~\$175,000~~
 15 *\$205,000.*

16 COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF

17 Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of Co-
 18 lumbia Institution for the Deaf, including personal services
 19 and miscellaneous expenses, and repairs and improvements,
 20 \$410,000: *Provided, That the Columbia Institution for the*
 21 *Deaf shall be paid by the District of Columbia, in advance*
 22 *at the beginning of each quarter, at the rate of \$1,295 per*
 23 *school year for each student attending said Institution*
 24 *pursuant to the Act of March 1, 1901 (31 D. C. Code*
 25 *1008).*

1 Construction: For the construction of a library-class-
2 room building at the Columbia Institution for the Deaf
3 \$240,000, to remain available until expended; and for
4 alterations, \$19,000; in all, \$259,000.

5 FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

6 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses for
7 carrying out the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act,
8 as amended (21 U. S. C. 301-392); the Tea Importation
9 Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 41-50); the Import Milk
10 Act (21 U. S. C. 141-149); the Federal Caustic Poison
11 Act (15 U. S. C. 401-411); and the Filled Milk Act, as
12 amended (21 U. S. C. 61-64); reporting and illustrating
13 the results of investigations; purchase of chemicals, appa-
14 ratus, and scientific equipment; not to exceed \$2,000 for
15 payment in advance for special tests and analyses by con-
16 tract; and payment of fees, travel, and per diem in connection
17 with studies of new developments pertinent to food and drug
18 enforcement operations; \$5,100,000.

19 Salaries and expenses, certification and inspection serv-
20 ices: For expenses necessary for the certification or in-
21 spection of certain products in accordance with sections
22 406, 504, 506, 507, 604, 702A, and 706 of the Federal
23 Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 346,
24 354, 356, 357, 364, 372a, and 376), the aggregate of
25 the advance deposits during the current fiscal year to cover

1 payment of fees by applicants for certification or inspection
2 of such products, to remain available until expended. The
3 total amount herein appropriated shall be available for
4 personal services; purchase of chemicals, apparatus, and
5 scientific equipment; and the refund of advance deposits
6 for which no service has been rendered.

7 FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL

8 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for opera-
9 tion and maintenance, including repairs; furnishing, repair-
10 ing, and cleaning of wearing apparel used by employees in
11 the performance of their official duties; transfer of funds to
12 the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Howard Univer-
13 sity" for salaries of technical and professional personnel de-
14 tailed to the hospital; payments to the appropriation of
15 Howard University for actual cost of heat, light, and
16 power furnished by such university; \$2,880,000: *Pro-*
17 *vided*, That no intern or resident physician receiving
18 compensation from this appropriation on a full-time basis
19 shall receive compensation in the form of wages or salary
20 from any other appropriation in this title: *Provided further*,
21 That the District of Columbia shall pay by check to Freed-
22 men's Hospital, upon the Surgeon General's request, in ad-
23 vance at the beginning of each quarter, such amount as the
24 Surgeon General calculates will be earned on the basis of
25 rates approved by the Bureau of the Budget for the care

1 of patients certified by the District of Columbia. Bills ren-
2 dered by the Surgeon General on the basis of such calcula-
3 tions shall not be subject to audit or certification in advance
4 of payment; but proper adjustment of amounts which have
5 been paid in advance on the basis of such calculations shall
6 be made at the end of each quarter: *Provided further*, That
7 the Surgeon General may delegate the responsibilities im-
8 posed upon him by the foregoing proviso.

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of Howard University, including personal services and miscellaneous expenses and repairs to buildings and grounds, \$2,720,000.

Construction of buildings: For the construction and equipment of buildings and facilities, under the supervision of the General Services Administration, on the grounds of Howard University, including engineering and architectural services and travel, to remain available until expended, as follows:

19 For a preclinical medical building, together with altera-
20 tions and installations in connection with such construction,
21 \$4,436,000.

For a power substation, together with necessary alterations within the power plant, \$272,000.

24 For repairs to the power plant, \$100,000.

25 Construction of buildings (liquidation of contract au-

1 thorization) : For payment of obligations incurred under
2 authority previously provided, to enter into contracts for the
3 construction of the following: Biology-greenhouse building,
4 \$250,000; law building, \$200,000; and administration build-
5 ing, \$700,000.

6 OFFICE OF EDUCATION

7 Promotion and further development of vocational educa-
8 tion: For carrying out the provisions of section 3 of the
9 Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20 U. S. C. 15),
10 section 4 of the Act of March 10, 1924 (20 U. S. C. 29),
11 section 1 of the Act of March 3, 1931 (20 U. S. C. 30),
12 and the Act of March 18, 1950 (Public Law 462),
13 \$23,673,261: *Provided*, That the apportionment to the
14 States under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 shall
15 be computed on the basis of not to exceed \$23,498,261 for
16 the current fiscal year: *Provided further*, That not more
17 than \$900,000 of this appropriation shall be available for
18 vocational education in distributive occupations.

19 Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and the
20 mechanic arts: For carrying out the provisions of section
21 22 of the Act of June 29, 1935, as amended, \$2,501,500.

22 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
23 Office of Education, including surveys, studies, investiga-
24 tions, and reports regarding libraries; fostering coordina-
25 tion of public and school library service; coordination of

1 library service on the national level with other forms of
2 adult education; developing library participation in Federal
3 projects; fostering Nation-wide coordination of research
4 materials among libraries, interstate library coordination and
5 the development of library service throughout the country;
6 purchase, distribution, and exchange of educational docu-
7 ments, motion-picture films, and lantern slides; collection,
8 exchange, and cataloging of educational apparatus and appli-
9 ances, articles of school furniture and models of school build-
10 ings illustrative of foreign and domestic systems and methods
11 of education, and repairing the same; \$2,900,000, of which
12 not less than \$480,000 shall be available for the Division
13 of Vocational Education as authorized: *Provided*, That all
14 receipts from non-Federal agencies representing reimburse-
15 ment for expenses of travel of employees of the Office of
16 Education performing advisory functions to the said agencies
17 shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to
18 the credit of this appropriation.

19 Payments to school districts: For payments to local
20 educational agencies for the maintenance and operation of
21 schools as authorized by the Act of September 30, 1950
22 (Public Law 874), as amended, ~~\$55,000,000~~ \$58,500,000:
23 *Provided*, That this appropriation shall also be available for
24 carrying out the provisions of section 6 of such Act: *Pro-*
25 *vided further, That the 3 per centum deduction provided for*

1 in section 3 (c) (1) of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Con-
 2 gress, as amended, shall not take effect for any fiscal year be-
 3 ginning prior to July 1, 1955.

4 Assistance for school construction: For an additional
 5 amount for providing school facilities and for grants to local
 6 educational agencies in federally affected areas, as author-
 7 ized by titles III and IV of the Act of September 23, 1950
 8 (Public Law 815), as amended, including not to exceed
 9 \$575,000 for necessary expenses of technical services ren-
 10 dered by other agencies, \$70,000,000, to remain available
 11 until expended, and of which \$12,000,000 shall be available
 12 for carrying out title IV of said Act: *Provided*, That no part
 13 of this appropriation shall be available for salaries or other
 14 direct expenses of the Department of Health, Education,
 15 and Welfare: *Provided further*, That the sum of \$125,000
 16 made available for "technical services rendered by other
 17 agencies" under this head in Public Law 357, 83d Congress,
 18 shall remain available through June 30, 1955.

19 OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

20 Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and
 21 Puerto Rico): For payments to States (including Alaska,
 22 Hawaii, and Puerto Rico) in accordance with the Vocational
 23 Rehabilitation Act, as amended (29 U. S. C., ch. 4) in-
 24 cluding payments, in accordance with regulations of the

1 Secretary, for one-half of necessary expenditures for the
2 acquisition of vending stands or other equipment in accord-
3 ance with section 3 (a) (3) (C) of said Act for the use of
4 blind persons, such stands or other equipment to be
5 controlled by the State agency, \$23,000,000, of which
6 not to exceed \$195,000 shall be available to the Sec-
7 retary for providing rehabilitation services to disabled
8 residents of the District of Columbia, as authorized by
9 section 6 of said Act, which latter amount shall be avail-
10 able for administrative expenses in connection with providing
11 such services in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That not
12 to exceed 15 per centum of the appropriation shall be
13 used for administrative purposes: *Provided further*, That
14 the funds herein appropriated shall be made available to
15 the States in accordance with the provisions of section 3 (a)
16 of Public Law 113 (Seventy-eighth Congress) approved
17 July 6, 1943.

18 Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and
19 Puerto Rico), next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after
20 May 31, of the current fiscal year, payments to States in
21 accordance with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as
22 amended (including the objects specified in the preceding
23 paragraph), for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal
24 year such sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred
25 and the expenditures made thereunder to be charged to the

1 appropriation therefor for that fiscal year: *Provided*, That
 2 the payments made pursuant to this paragraph shall not
 3 exceed the amount paid to the States for the first quarter of
 4 the current fiscal year.

5 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary in carry-
 6 ing out the provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act,
 7 as amended, and of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (20
 8 U. S. C., ch. 6A), including not to exceed \$3,000 for pro-
 9 duction, purchase, and distribution of educational films;
 10 ~~\$620,000~~ \$650,000.

11 PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

12 For necessary expenses in carrying out the Public Health
 13 Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 6A) (herein-
 14 after referred to as the Act), and other Acts, including
 15 expenses for active commissioned officers in the Reserve
 16 Corps and for not to exceed one thousand five hundred com-
 17 missioned officers in the Regular Corps, *and expenses for*
 18 *primary and secondary schooling for dependents of per-*
 19 *sonnel of the service stationed outside the continental limits*
 20 *of the United States in amounts not exceeding \$225 per*
 21 *student when the Surgeon General finds that schools avail-*
 22 *able in the locality are unable to provide adequately for the*
 23 *education of such dependents*, as follows:

24 Assistance to States, general: To carry out the pur-
 25 poses, not otherwise specifically provided for, of section 314

1 (c) of the Act; to provide consultative services to States
2 pursuant to section 311 of the Act; to make field investiga-
3 tions and demonstrations pursuant to section 301 of the
4 Act; to provide for collecting and compiling mortality,
5 morbidity, and vital statistics; and not to exceed \$1,000
6 for entertainment of officials of other countries when specifi-
7 cally authorized by the Surgeon General; \$13,000,000, of
8 which not more than \$2,400,000 shall be available for
9 personal services.

10 Venereal diseases: To carry out the purposes of sections
11 314 (a) and 363 of the Act with respect to venereal diseases
12 including the operation and maintenance of centers for the
13 diagnosis and treatment of persons afflicted with venereal
14 diseases; and for grants of money, services, supplies, equip-
15 ment, and use of facilities to States, as defined in the Act.
16 and with the approval of the respective State health author-
17 ities, to counties, health districts, and other political sub-
18 divisions of the States, for the foregoing purposes, in such
19 amounts and upon such terms and conditions as the Surgeon
20 General may determine; \$3,000,000.

21 Tuberculosis: To carry out the purposes of section 314
22 (b) of the Act, \$6,000,000, *of which not less than \$4,500,-*
23 *000 shall be available only for grants to States, to be matched*
24 *by an equal amount of State funds expended for the same*
25 *purpose, for direct expenses of case-finding projects including*

1 salaries, fees, and travel of personnel directly engaged in case
2 finding and the necessary equipment and supplies used
3 directly in case-finding operations, but excluding the purchase
4 of care in hospitals and sanatoria.

5 Communicable diseases: To carry out, except as other-
6 wise provided for, those provisions of sections 301, 311, and
7 361 of the Act relating to the prevention and suppression
8 of communicable and preventable diseases, and the inter-
9 state transmission and spread thereof, including the purchase,
10 erection, and maintenance of portable buildings; and hire,
11 maintenance, and operation of aircraft; \$4,300,000.

12 Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene: For
13 expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary to carry out
14 those provisions of sections 301, 311, 314 (c), and 361 of
15 the Act relating to sanitation and other aspects of environ-
16 mental health, including enforcement of applicable quaran-
17 tine laws and interstate quarantine regulations, and for carry-
18 ing out the purposes of the Water Pollution Control Act (33
19 U. S. C. 466–466 (j)) ; \$3,295,000, of which not less than
20 \$270,000 shall be available only for completing construction
21 of the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center, Cincin-
22 nati, Ohio.

23 Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Ter-
24 ritory of Alaska: To enable the Surgeon General to conduct,

1 in the Service, and to cooperate with and assist the Territory
 2 of Alaska in the conduct of, activities necessary in the
 3 investigation, prevention, treatment, and control of diseases,
 4 and the establishment and maintenance of health and sani-
 5 tation services pursuant to and for the purposes specified in
 6 sections 301, 311, 314 (without regard to the provisions of
 7 subsections (d), (f), (h), and (j) and the limitations set
 8 forth in subsection (c) of such section), 361 and 363 of the
 9 Act, including the hire, operation, and maintenance of air-
 10 craft, and the purchase, erection, and maintenance of port-
 11 able buildings, \$1,125,000,—of which not less than \$160,000
 12 shall be available only for the activation and operation of the
 13 two immobilized marine health units “Health” and
 14 “Hygiene”.

15 Grants for hospital construction: For payments for
 16 hospital construction under part C, title VI, of the Act, as
 17 amended, to remain available until expended, \$75,000,000:
 18 *Provided*, That allotments under such part C to the several
 19 States for the current fiscal year shall be made on the basis
 20 of an amount equal to the appropriation granted herein.

21 Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services:
 22 For salaries and expenses incident to carrying out title VI
 23 of the Act, as amended, ~~\$750,000~~ \$950,000.

24 Hospitals and medical care: For carrying out the func-
 25 tions of the Public Health Service under the Act of August

1 8, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 150) , and under sections 321, 322, 324,
2 326, 331, 332, 341, 343, 344, 502, 504, and 710 of the
3 Public Health Service Act, and Executive Order 9079 of
4 February 26, 1942, including purchase and exchange of
5 farm products and livestock; conducting research on tech-
6 nical nursing standards and furnishing consultative nursing
7 services; and purchase of firearms and ammunition;
8 \$33,000,000, of which \$1,000,000 shall be exclusively
9 available for payments to the Territory of Hawaii for care
10 and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy: *Provided*,
11 That when the Public Health Service establishes or operates
12 a health service program for any department or agency,
13 payment for the estimated cost shall be made in advance for
14 deposit to the credit of this appropriation.

15 Foreign quarantine service: For carrying out the pur-
16 poses of sections 361 to 369 of the Act, relating to prevent-
17 ing the introduction of communicable diseases from foreign
18 countries, the medical examination of aliens in accordance
19 with section 325 of the Act, and the care and treatment of
20 quarantine detainees pursuant to section 322 (e) of the
21 Act in private or other public hospitals when facilities of
22 the Public Health Service are not available, including in-
23 surance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when
24 required by law of such countries; \$2,900,000.

25 National Institutes of Health, operating expenses: For

1 the activities of the National Institutes of Health, not other-
2 wise provided for, including research fellowships and grants
3 for research projects pursuant to section 301 of the Act; not
4 to exceed \$1,000 for entertainment of visiting scientists when
5 specifically approved by the Surgeon General; erection of
6 temporary structures; and grants of therapeutic and chemical
7 substances for demonstrations and research; \$4,675,000:
8 *Provided*, That the Surgeon General is authorized to advance
9 to this appropriation from other appropriations to the Public
10 Health Service such amounts as are determined to be neces-
11 sary for the foregoing purposes and for activities performed
12 on a centralized basis: *Provided further*, That the Surgeon
13 General is authorized to operate facilities at the National
14 Institutes of Health for the sale of meals to employees and
15 others at rates determined by him to be sufficient to recover
16 the cost of such operation and the proceeds thereof shall be
17 credited to this appropriation.

18 National Cancer Institute: To enable the Surgeon Gen-
19 eral, upon the recommendations of the National Advisory
20 Cancer Council, to make grants-in-aid for research and train-
21 ing projects relating to cancer; to cooperate with State health
22 agencies, and other public and private nonprofit institutions,
23 in the prevention, control, and eradication of cancer by
24 providing consultative services, demonstrations, and grants-

1 in-aid; and to otherwise carry out the provisions of title IV,
2 part A, of the Act; ~~\$21,237,000~~ \$22,737,000.

3 Mental health activities: For expenses necessary for
4 carrying out the provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 311,
5 312, and 314 (c) of the Act with respect to mental diseases,
6 ~~\$13,460,000~~ \$14,460,000.

7 National Heart Institute: For expenses necessary to
8 carry out the purposes of the National Heart Act,
9 ~~\$16,168,000~~ \$17,168,000.

10 Dental health activities: For expenses not otherwise
11 provided for, necessary to enable the Surgeon General to
12 carry out the purposes of the Act with respect to dental
13 diseases and conditions, ~~\$1,740,000~~ \$1,990,000.

14 Arthritis and metabolic disease activities: For expenses
15 necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act relating to
16 arthritis, rheumatism, and metabolic diseases, ~~\$7,270,000~~
17 \$9,270,000.

18 Microbiology activities: For expenses necessary to carry
19 out the purposes of the Act relating to microbiology, in-
20 cluding the regulation and preparation of biologic products,
21 ~~\$5,930,000~~ \$6,430,000.

22 Neurology and blindness activities: For expenses nec-
23 essary to carry out the purposes of the Act relating to
24 neurology and blindness, ~~\$6,913,000~~ \$8,413,000.

1 Gorgas Memorial Laboratory: For payment to the
2 Gorgas Memorial Institute for maintenance and operation
3 of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, \$131,000.

4 Retired pay of commissioned officers: For retired pay
5 of commissioned officers, as authorized by law, and payments
6 under the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of
7 1953, \$1,141,000.

8 Salaries and expenses: For the divisions and offices of
9 the Office of the Surgeon General and for miscellaneous
10 expenses of the Public Health Service not appropriated for
11 elsewhere, including preparing information, articles, and
12 publications related to public health; and conducting studies
13 and demonstrations in public health methods; \$2,780,000.

14 Administrative provisions: During the current fiscal
15 year, and with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget,
16 there may be transferred from any annual appropriation
17 to the Public Health Service to any other such appropria-
18 tion such additional amounts as may be required for pay
19 and allowances of the active commissioned officers herein
20 authorized, but any amounts so transferred shall not exceed
21 5 per centum of any such appropriation and no such appro-
22 priation shall be increased by more than 5 per centum as a
23 result of any such transfers.

SAINT ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of the hospital, including purchase of clothing for patients and cooperation with organizations or individuals in the scientific research into the nature, causes, prevention and treatment of mental illness, \$2,445,000.

Major repairs and preservation of buildings and grounds: For miscellaneous construction, alterations, repairs, and equipment, on the grounds of the hospital, including preparation of plans and specifications, advertising, and supervision of construction, \$709,000: *Provided*, That any part of this amount may be transferred to the General Services Administration: *Provided further*, That the services financed by this appropriation shall be included in the term "care" as used in section 2 of the Act of August 4, 1947 (24 U. S. C. 168a).

Construction, maximum security building: For the preparation of tentative drawings for a maximum security building at Saint Elizabeths Hospital, \$110,000: Provided, That with respect to construction of new facilities hereafter authorized the per diem rate calculated for the District of Columbia pursuant to section 2 of the Act of August 4, 1947 (24

1 *U. S. C. 168a), shall include a proportionate share of the*
 2 *annual increment of the depreciated total cost of such con-*
 3 *struction, such depreciation to be based on the estimated life,*
 4 *not exceeding forty years, of such construction, to be deter-*
 5 *mined by the Board of Commissioners of the District of*
 6 *Columbia, beginning with the fiscal year following completion*
 7 *of construction, and such proportionate share shall be de-*
 8 *posited in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.*

9 **SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION**

10 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors
 11 Insurance: For necessary expenses, including furnishing,
 12 repairing, and cleaning of wearing apparel and equipment
 13 used by building guards; not more than ~~\$64,150,000~~
 14 \$64,650,000 may be expended from the Federal old-age and
 15 survivors insurance trust fund.

16 Grants to States for public assistance: For grants to
 17 States for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid
 18 to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled,
 19 as authorized in titles I, IV, X, and XIV of the Social
 20 Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subchs. I, IV,
 21 X, and XIV), \$1,200,000,000, of which such amount as may
 22 be necessary shall be available for grants for any period in
 23 the prior fiscal year subsequent to March 31 of that year:
 24 *Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used*
 25 *for payments to a State under titles I, IV, and X for ad-*

1 ministration of the State plan in excess of 7 per centum of
2 the Federal share of assistance payments under each such
3 plan.

4 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance: For
5 expenses necessary for the Bureau of Public Assistance,
6 \$1,450,000 \$1,550,000.

7 Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau: For necessary
8 expenses in carrying out the Act of April 9, 1912, as
9 amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 6), and title V of the Social
10 Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V),
11 including purchase of reports and material for the publica-
12 tions of the Children's Bureau and of reprints for distribution,
13 \$1,525,000: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation
14 contained in this title shall be used to promulgate or carry
15 out any instructions, order, or regulation relating to the care
16 of obstetrical cases which discriminate between persons
17 licensed under State law to practice obstetrics: *Provided*
18 *further*, That the foregoing proviso shall not be so construed
19 as to prevent any patient from having the services of any
20 practitioner of her own choice, paid for out of this fund, so
21 long as State laws are complied with: *Provided further*,
22 That any State plan which provides standards for professional
23 obstetrical services in accordance with the laws of the State
24 shall be approved.

25 Grants to States for maternal and child welfare: For

1 grants to States for maternal and child-health services, serv-
2 ices for crippled children, and child-welfare services as
3 authorized in title V, parts 1, 2, and 3, of the Social Security
4 Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V), \$30,000,-
5 000: *Provided*, That any allotment to a State pursuant to
6 section 502 (b) or 512 (b) of such Act shall not be included
7 in computing for the purposes of subsections (a) and (b) of
8 sections 504 and 514 of such Act an amount expended or
9 estimated to be expended by the State.

10 Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner: For
11 expenses necessary for the Office of the Commissioner of
12 Social Security, \$173,000, together with not to exceed
13 \$123,500 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and
14 survivors insurance trust fund.

15 Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For mak-
16 ing, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to
17 States under titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV, respectively, of
18 the Social Security Act, as amended, for the first quarter of
19 the next succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may be neces-
20 sary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures made
21 thereunder for payments under each of such titles to be
22 charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year.

23 In the administration of titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV,
24 respectively, of the Social Security Act, as amended, pay-
25 ments to a State under any of such titles for any quarter

1 in the period beginning April 1 of the prior year, and ending
 2 June 30 of the current year, may be made with respect to a
 3 State plan approved under such title prior to or during such
 4 period, but no such payment shall be made with respect to
 5 any plan for any quarter prior to the quarter in which such
 6 plan was submitted for approval.

7 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

8 Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary: For
 9 expenses necessary for the Office of the Secretary, ~~\$1,075,-~~
 10 ~~000~~ \$1,150,000, together with not to exceed \$171,000 to be
 11 transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance
 12 trust fund: *Provided*, That not more than \$200,000 addi-
 13 tional may be transferred to this head from other appropria-
 14 tions.

15 Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Services: For
 16 expenses necessary for the Office of Field Services,
 17 including not less than \$850,000 for the Division of Grant-
 18 in-Aid Audits, ~~\$1,775,000~~ \$1,835,000, together with not to
 19 exceed \$350,000 to be transferred from the Federal old-age
 20 and survivors insurance trust fund.

21 Salaries and expenses, Office of the General Counsel: For
 22 expenses necessary for the Office of the General Counsel,
 23 \$350,000, together with not to exceed \$22,500 to be trans-
 24 ferred from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, certifi-
 25 cation and inspection services", and not to exceed \$365,000

1 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors in-
 2 surance trust fund.

3 Surplus property disposal: For expenses necessary for
 4 carrying out the provisions of subsections 203 (j) and (k)
 5 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act
 6 of 1949, as amended, relating to disposal of real and personal
 7 excess property for educational purposes and protection of
 8 public health, \$400,000.

9 *Working capital fund: The working capital fund estab-*
 10 *lished in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act,*
 11 *1953 (66 Stat. 369), shall be available for financing the*
 12 *additional functions of central accounting service and central*
 13 *internal audit service.*

14 GENERAL PROVISIONS

15 SEC. 202. Appropriations under this title available for
 16 salaries and expenses shall be available for payment in
 17 advance for dues or fees for library membership in organiza-
 18 tions whose publications are available to members only or to
 19 members at a price lower than to the general public.

20 SEC. 203. Appropriations under this title available for
 21 salaries and expenses shall be available for services as
 22 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5
 23 U. S. C. 55a).

24 SEC. 204. Appropriations under this title available for
 25 salaries and expenses shall be available for travel expenses

1 and not to exceed ~~\$75,000~~ \$105,000, of which \$45,000 shall
2 be available only to the National Institutes of Health, of such
3 funds shall be available for expenses of attendance at meet-
4 ings concerned with the functions or activities for which such
5 appropriations are made.

6 SEC. 205. None of the funds appropriated by this title
7 to the Social Security Administration for grants in aid of
8 State agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of
9 operation of said agencies including the salaries and expenses
10 of officers and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld
11 from the said agencies of any States which have established
12 by legislative enactment and have in operation a merit sys-
13 tem and classification and compensation plan covering the
14 selection, tenure in office, and compensation of their em-
15 ployees, because of any disapproval of their personnel or
16 the manner of their selection by the agencies of the said
17 States, or the rates of pay of said officers or employees.

18 SEC. 206. The Secretary is authorized to make such
19 transfers of motor vehicles, between bureaus and offices,
20 without transfer of funds, as may be required in carrying
21 out the operations of the Department.

22 SEC. 207. In order to more effectively administer the
23 programs and functions of the Department, the Secretary
24 is authorized to transfer not to exceed 1 per centum of any
25 appropriation in this title available for salaries and expenses

1 to any other such appropriation but no such appropriation
 2 shall be increased by more than 1 per centum by any such
 3 transfer: *Provided, That no such transfers shall be used for*
 4 *the creation of new functions within the Department, nor*
 5 *shall the total amount transferred in fiscal year 1955 exceed*
 6 *\$100,000.*

7 This title may be cited as the "Department of Health,
 8 Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1955".

9 TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

10 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
 11 National Labor Relations Board to carry out the functions
 12 vested in it by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947
 13 (29 U. S. C. 141-167), and other laws, including expenses
 14 of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the
 15 Board when specifically authorized by the Chairman or the
 16 General Counsel; and services as authorized by section
 17 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a);
 18 \$8,400,000: *Provided, That no part of this appropriation*
 19 *shall be available to organize or assist in organizing agricul-*
 20 *tural laborers or used in connection with investigations, hear-*
 21 *ings, directives, or orders concerning bargaining units com-*
 22 *posed of agricultural laborers as referred to in section 2 (3)*
 23 *of the Act of July 5, 1935 (49 Stat. 450), and as amended*
 24 *by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and as*
 25 *defined in section 3 (f) of the Act of June 25, 1938 (52*

1 Stat. 1060), and including in said definition employees
 2 engaged in the maintenance and operation of ditches, canals,
 3 reservoirs, and waterways when maintained or operated on
 4 a mutual, nonprofit basis and at least 95 per centum of the
 5 water stored or supplied thereby is used for farming pur-
 6 poses.

7 This title may be cited as the "National Labor
 8 Relations Board Appropriation Act, 1955".

9 TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

10 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
 11 National Mediation Board, including stenographic reporting
 12 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August
 13 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), ~~\$422,000~~ \$429,000.

14 Arbitration and emergency boards: For expenses neces-
 15 sary for arbitration boards established under section 7 of
 16 the Railway Labor Act, as amended (45 U. S. C. 157),
 17 and emergency boards appointed by the President pursuant
 18 to section 10 of said Act (45 U. S. C. 160), including
 19 stenographic reporting services as authorized by section 15
 20 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$300,000.

21 NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

22 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
 23 National Railroad Adjustment Board, including stenographic
 24 reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
 25 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$495,000, of which not

1 less than \$175,000 shall be available for compensation (at
2 rates not in excess of \$75 per diem) and expenses of referees
3 appointed pursuant to section 3 of the Railway Labor Act,
4 as amended.

5 This title may be cited as the “National Mediation
6 Board Appropriation Act, 1955”.

7 TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

8 Salaries and expenses, Railroad Retirement Board (trust
9 fund) : For expenses necessary for the Railroad Retirement
10 Board, including not to exceed \$1,000 for expenses of attend-
11 ance at meetings concerned with the work of the Board, when
12 specifically authorized by the Board; and stenographic re-
13 porting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
14 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; \$6,108,000, to be derived
15 from the railroad retirement account.

16 This title may be cited as the “Railroad Retirement Board
17 Appropriation Act, 1955”.

18 TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND 19 CONCILIATION SERVICE

20 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
21 Service to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-
22 Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 171-180,
23 182), including expenses of the Labor-Management Panel
24 as provided in section 205 of said Act; temporary employ-
25 ment of arbitrators, conciliators, and mediators on labor

1 relations at rates not in excess of \$75 per diem; expenses of
2 attendance at meetings concerned with labor and industrial
3 relations; and services as authorized by section 15 of the
4 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; \$3,124,000.

5 Boards of inquiry: To enable the Service to pay neces-
6 sary expenses of boards of inquiry appointed by the President
7 pursuant to section 206 of the Labor-Management Relations
8 Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 176-180, 182), including services
9 as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
10 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and rent in the District of Columbia,
11 \$10,000.

12 This title may be cited as the "Federal Mediation and
13 Conciliation Service Appropriation Act, 1955".

14 TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

15 SEC. 701. No part of any appropriation contained in this
16 Act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person
17 who engages in a strike against the Government of the
18 United States or who is a member of an organization of Gov-
19 ernment employees that asserts the right to strike against
20 the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or
21 is a member of an organization that advocates, the over-
22 throw of the Government of the United States by force or
23 violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit
24 shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person
25 making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this

1 section engaged in a strike against the Government of the
2 United States, is not a member of an organization of Gov-
3 ernment employees that asserts the right to strike against
4 the Government of the United States, or that such person
5 does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization
6 that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the
7 United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That
8 any person who engages in a strike against the Government
9 of the United States, or who is a member of an organization
10 of Government employees that asserts the right to strike
11 against the Government of the United States, or who advo-
12 cates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates,
13 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by
14 force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages
15 for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this
16 Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be
17 fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than
18 one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty
19 clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any
20 other provisions of existing law.

21 SEC. 702. No part of any appropriation contained in this
22 Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not
23 authorized by the Congress.

24 SEC. 703. No part of any appropriation contained in this
25 Act shall be used to pay compensation of any employee

1 engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that
2 would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one
3 hundred and five, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and
4 intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided,*
5 That for purposes of this section employees shall be con-
6 sidered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time
7 or more in personnel administration consisting of direction
8 and administration of the personnel program; employment,
9 placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification;
10 employee relations and services; training; committees of
11 expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage
12 administration; and processing, recording, and reporting.

13 This Act may be cited as the "Departments of Labor,
14 and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act,
15 1955."

Passed the House of Representatives June 10, 1954.

Attest:

LYLE O. SNADER,

Clerk.

83^d CONGRESS
2^d Session

H. R. 9447

[Report No. 1623]

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

JUNE 11, 1954

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Appropriations

JUNE 22, 1954

Reported with amendments

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued June 28, 1954
For actions of June 25, 1954
83rd-2nd, No. 118

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....8	Forestry.....14,18	Reclamation.....16,20
Appropriations...3,5,12,15	Labor, farm.....3	Reports.....6
Cotton.....19	Loans, farm.....4	Surplus commodities..17,19
Electrification.....11	Lobbying.....4	Taxation.....6,8
Extension work.....1	Personnel.....10,13,21	Unemployment compensation.....13
Farm program.....7,9	Pesticide chemicals.....2	Vehicles.....6
Foreign aid.....20	REA.....5	

HIGHLIGHTS: House committee reported farm program bill. Senate passed bill to transfer Indian extension work to USDA and States. Senate passed Labor-HEW appropriation bill with amendment to aid migratory labor. Senate committee reported bill to regulate pesticide chemicals. Sen. Williams claimed FCA lobbying against amendment to limit broiler loans. Sen. Aiken claimed unfair tactics in sponsoring amendment to increase REA appropriations. House committee voted to report bill to provide unemployment compensation for Federal employees. President approved O&C land bill June 24.

SENATE

1. EXTENSION WORK. Passed with amendments S. 3385, to transfer to this Department and the States the agricultural extension work among Indians. Agreed to an amendment by Sen. Hayden to exempt Arizona and New Mexico from the bill. (pp. 8518-20.)
2. PESTICIDE CHEMICALS. The Labor and Public Welfare Committee reported with amendment H. R. 7125, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to regulate residues of pesticide chemicals in or on raw agricultural commodities (S. Rept. 1635)(p. 8452).
3. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed with amendments H. R. 9447, the Labor-HEW appropriation bill for 1955 (pp. 8459, 8469, 8471-6, 8478-83). Agreed to an amendment by Sen. Cooper to increase the Bureau of Labor Standards by \$100,000 so as to improve the conditions in migratory labor (pp. 8471-3). Senate conferees were appointed. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 8873, the defense appropriation bill for 1955, and acted upon amendments in disagreement (pp. 8455-9). This bill will now be sent to the President.
Passed with amendments H. R. 9517, the D. C. appropriation bill for 1955 (pp. 8496-9). Senate conferees were appointed. The bill had been reported by the Appropriations Committee earlier in the day (S. Rept. 1634)(p. 8452).
The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments H. R. 9203, the legislative-judiciary appropriation bill for 1955 (S. Rept. 1630)(p. 8452).
4. FARM LOANS. Sen. Williams charged FCA with lobbying activities in opposition to his amendment to limit loans to broiler producers (pp. 8476-8).

5. REA APPROPRIATIONS. Sen. Aiken stated that the \$35 million additional for REA, as provided by the Douglas amendment, was unnecessary and claimed unfair tactics by the management of NRECA in this connection (pp. 8483-7).
6. VEHICLES; REPORTS; TAXATION. A subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee reported to the full Committee H. R. 8753, to authorize GSA motor vehicle pools, etc.; and H. R. 6290, to discontinue various requirements for reports to Congress, etc. The subcommittee deferred action until June 30 on S. 2473, providing for payments in lieu of taxes on Federal lands. (p. D739.)
7. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Langer inserted a Farmers Union local resolution on various aspects of the farm program (pp. 8450-1).
8. RECESSED until Mon., June 28 (p. 8520). H. R. 8300, the tax revision bill, was made the unfinished business (p. 8520).

HOUSE

9. FARM PROGRAM. The Agriculture Committee reported (June 26) H. R. 9680, to provide for continued price support for agricultural products; to augment the marketing and disposal of such products; and to provide for greater stability in the products of agriculture (p. D740).
10. RETIREMENT. A subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee approved for reporting to the full committee H. R. 7785, to make permanent the increases in regular annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act, and extend such increases to additional annuities purchased by voluntary contributions (p. D741).
11. ELECTRIFICATION. A subcommittee of the Public Works Committee approved for reporting to the full committee H. R. 4541, authorizing the modification of the general plan for the comprehensive development of the Columbia River Basin to provide for additional hydroelectric power development (p. D741).
12. INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955. Conferees agreed to file a conference report (but did not actually file) on this bill, H. R. 8680 (p. D742).
13. PERSONNEL. The Ways and Means Committee approved for reporting (but did not actually report) a bill to extend Federal unemployment compensation benefits to additional workers. The "Daily Digest" states: "The bill, which is expected to be introduced and formally reported in the House next week, will now cover for the first time 2,500,000 Federal employees plus an additional 1,500,000 from private industry." (p. D741.)

BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

14. FORESTRY. S. 2225, relating to administrative jurisdiction over certain O&C land in Oreg. Provides for continued administration of the controverted lands by the Forest Service, with accounting of funds heretofore or hereafter received to be the same as for other O&C land receipts, and provides for consolidation of the checker-board administrative areas through exchanges of land by the Agriculture and Interior Departments. Approved June 24, 1954. (Public Law 426, 83rd Cong.)
15. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955. Approved June 24, 1955. (Public Law 428, 83rd Cong.)

83^D CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 9447

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 25, 1954

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Depart-
5 ments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and
6 related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending
7 June 30, 1955, namely:

1 TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

2 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

3 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
 4 Office of the Secretary of Labor (hereafter in this title
 5 referred to as the Secretary) , including services as authorized
 6 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ;
 7 teletype news service; and payment in advance when
 8 authorized by the Secretary for dues or fees for library
 9 membership in organizations whose publications are avail-
 10 able to members only or to members at a price lower than
 11 to the general public; ~~(1)\$1,300,000~~ \$1,354,000 ~~(2), of~~
 12 ~~which not more than \$60,000 shall be for international labor~~
 13 ~~affairs.~~

14 OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

15 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
 16 Office of the Solicitor, \$1,450,000.

17 BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS

18 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
 19 promotion of industrial safety, employment stabilization, and
 20 amicable industrial relations for labor and industry; per-
 21 formance of safety functions of the Secretary under the Fed-
 22 eral Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (5 U. S. C.
 23 784 (c)) ; performance of the functions vested in the Sec-
 24 retary by title I of the Labor-Management Relations Act,

1 1947 (29 U. S. C. 159 (f) and (g)) ; ~~(3)~~*not to exceed*
 2 *\$100,000 for improving the conditions of migratory labor;*
 3 and not less than \$75,000 for the work of the President's
 4 Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped
 5 Week, as authorized by the Act of July 11, 1949 (63 Stat.
 6 409) and provided further that no part of the appropriation
 7 for the President's Committee shall be subject to reduction or
 8 transfer to any other department or agency under the provi-
 9 sions of any existing law; including purchase of reports and of
 10 material for informational exhibits and expenses of attendance
 11 of cooperating officials and consultants at conferences con-
 12 cerned with the work of the Bureau of Labor Standards;
 13 ~~(4)~~~~\$665,000~~ \$780,000.

14 BUREAU OF VETERANS' REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS

15 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to
 16 render assistance in connection with the exercise of re-
 17 employment rights under section 8 of the Selective Training
 18 and Service Act of 1940, as amended (50 U. S. C. App.
 19 308), the Service Extension Act of 1941, as amended, the
 20 Army Reserve and Retired Personnel Service Law of 1940,
 21 as amended, and section 9 of the Universal Military Train-
 22 ing and Service Act, and, under the Act of June 23, 1943,
 23 as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 1472), of persons who have
 24 performed service in the Merchant Marine, \$300,000.

1 BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP

2 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to en-
3 able the Secretary to conduct a program of encouraging
4 apprentice training as authorized by the Act of August 16,
5 1937 (29 U. S. C. 50), \$3,100,000.

6 BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

7 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
8 general administration of the employment service and unem-
9 ployment compensation programs, including temporary em-
10 ployment of persons, without regard to the civil-service laws,
11 for the farm placement migratory labor program; and not
12 to exceed \$10,000 for services as authorized by section 15
13 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; ~~(5)\$4,650,-~~
14 ~~000 \$4,760,000~~, of which \$1,100,000 ~~(6)shall~~ *may* be for
15 carrying into effect the provisions of title IV (except section
16 602) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

17 Grants to States for unemployment compensation and
18 employment service administration: For grants in accord-
19 ance with the provisions of the Act of June 6, 1933, as
20 amended (29 U. S. C. 49-49n), for carrying into effect
21 section 602 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944,
22 for grants to the States as authorized in title III of the Social
23 Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 501-503), including,
24 upon the request of any State, the purchase of equipment,
25 and the payment of rental for space made available to

1 such State in lieu of grants for such purpose, for nec-
2 essary expenses in connection with the operation of em-
3 ployment office facilities and services in the District of
4 Columbia, and for expenses not otherwise provided for,
5 necessary for carrying out title IV of the Veterans' Readjust-
6 ment Assistance Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 684), \$216,-
7 400,000, of which ~~(7)\$16,400,000~~ \$6,000,000 shall be
8 available only to the extent that the Secretary finds neces-
9 sary to meet increased costs of administration resulting from
10 changes in a State law or increases in the numbers of claims
11 filed and claims paid ~~(8)~~ *or salary costs* over those upon
12 which the State's basic grant (or the allocation for the Dis-
13 trict of Columbia) was based, which increased costs of ad-
14 ministration cannot be provided for by normal budgetary
15 adjustments: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any pro-
16 vision to the contrary in section 302 (a) of the Social
17 Security Act, as amended, the Secretary of Labor shall
18 from time to time certify to the Secretary of the
19 Treasury for payment to each State found to be in com-
20 pliance with the requirements of the Act of June 6, 1933,
21 and, except in the case of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands,
22 with the provisions of section 303 of the Social Security Act,
23 as amended, such amounts as he determines to be necessary
24 for the proper and efficient administration of its unemploy-
25 ment compensation law and of its public employment offices:

1 *Provided further*, That such amounts as may be agreed upon
2 by the Department of Labor and the Post Office Department
3 shall be used for the payment, in such manner as said parties
4 may jointly determine, of postage for the transmission of
5 official mail matter in connection with the administration of
6 unemployment compensation systems and employment serv-
7 ices by States receiving grants herefrom.

8 In carrying out the provisions of said Act of June 6,
9 1933, the provisions of section 303 (a) (1) of the Social
10 Security Act, as amended, relating to the establishment and
11 maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, shall
12 apply.

13 None of the funds appropriated by this title to the
14 Bureau of Employment Security for grants-in-aid of State
15 agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of operation
16 of said agencies including the salaries and expenses of officers
17 and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld from the
18 said agencies of any States which have established by legis-
19 lative enactment and have in operation a merit system and
20 classification and compensation plan covering the selection,
21 tenure in office, and compensation of their employees, be-
22 cause of any disapproval of their personnel or the manner
23 of their selection by the agencies of the said States, or the
24 rates of pay of said officers or employees.

1 Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For mak-
2 ing, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to
3 States under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended,
4 and under the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended, for the first
5 quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may
6 be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures
7 made thereunder for payments under such title and under
8 such Act of June 6, 1933, to be charged to the appropriation
9 therefor for that fiscal year.

10 Unemployment compensation for veterans: For pay-
11 ments to unemployed veterans as authorized by title IV of
12 the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952,
13 \$55,600,000.

14 Unemployment compensation for veterans, next succeed-
15 ing fiscal year: For making, after May 31 of the current
16 fiscal year, payments to States, as authorized by title IV
17 of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, such
18 sums as may be necessary to pay benefits for the first quarter
19 of the next succeeding fiscal year, and the obligations and
20 expenditures thereunder shall be charged to the appropria-
21 tion therefor for that fiscal year.

22 Salaries and expenses, Mexican farm labor program:
23 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to
24 carry out the functions of the Department of Labor under

1 the Act of July 12, 1951 (Public Law 78), as amended,
2 including temporary employment of persons without regard
3 to the civil service laws, ~~(9)\$1,521,000~~ \$1,581,000.

4 BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION

5 Salaries and expenses: For necessary administrative
6 expenses and not to exceed \$112,000 for the Employees'
7 Compensation Appeals Board, \$2,030,000, together with
8 not to exceed \$90,000 to be derived from the War Claims
9 Fund created by section 13 (a) of the War Claims Act
10 of 1948 (50 U. S. C. 2012).

11 Employees' compensation fund: For the payment of
12 compensation and other benefits and expenses (except ad-
13 ministrative expenses) authorized by law and accruing dur-
14 ing the current or any prior fiscal year, including payments
15 to other Federal agencies for medical and hospital services
16 pursuant to agreement approved by the Bureau of Employ-
17 ees' Compensation; continuation of payment of benefits as
18 provided for under the head "Civilian War Benefits" in the
19 Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1947; the
20 advancement of costs for enforcement of recoveries in third-
21 party cases; the furnishing of medical and hospital services
22 and supplies, treatment, and funeral and burial expenses,
23 including transportation and other expenses incidental to
24 such services, treatment, and burial, for such enrollees of the

1 Civilian Conservation Corps as were certified by the Director
2 of such Corps as receiving hospital services and treatment
3 at Government expense on June 30, 1943, and who are
4 not otherwise entitled thereto as civilian employees of the
5 United States, and the limitations and authority of the Act
6 of September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U. S. C. 796), shall
7 apply in providing such services, treatment, and expenses in
8 such cases; such amount as may be required during the
9 current fiscal year: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall
10 be available for payments pursuant to sections 4 (c) and
11 5 (f) of the War Claims Act of 1948 (50 U. S. C. 2012)
12 and shall be credited with advances or reimbursements there-
13 for from the War Claims Fund created by section 13 (a)
14 of said War Claims Act of 1948.

15 BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

16 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
17 work of the Bureau, including advances or reimbursement
18 to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees
19 for services rendered, and not to exceed \$15,000 for serv-
20 ices as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,
21 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$5,350,000.

22 WOMEN'S BUREAU

23 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the

1 work of the Women's Bureau, as authorized by the Act of
 2 June 5, 1920 (29 U. S. C. 11-16), including purchase of
 3 reports and material for informational exhibits, \$348,000.

4 WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

5 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for per-
 6 forming the duties imposed by the Fair Labor Standards
 7 Act of 1938, as amended, and the Act to provide conditions
 8 for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by
 9 the United States, approved June 30, 1936, as amended
 10 (41 U. S. C. 35-45), including reimbursement to State,
 11 Federal, and local agencies and their employees for inspec-
 12 tion services rendered, and not to exceed \$3,000 for ex-
 13 penses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants
 14 at conferences concerned with the work of the Division,
 15 **(10)**~~\$6,000,000~~ \$6,233,000.

16 GENERAL PROVISIONS

17 SEC. 102. Appropriations under this title available for
 18 salaries and expenses shall be available for stenographic
 19 reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
 20 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and for expenses of
 21 attendance at meetings concerned with the function or activ-
 22 ity for which any such appropriation is made.

23 **(11)***SEC. 103. Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appro-*
 24 *priation in this title available for salaries and expenses may*
 25 *be transferred to any other such appropriation, but no such*

1 *appropriation shall be increased by more than 5 per centum*
 2 *by any such transfer: Provided, That no such transfer shall*
 3 *be used for creation of new functions within the Department,*
 4 *nor shall the total amount transferred in fiscal year 1955*
 5 *exceed \$100,000.*

6 This title may be cited as the "Department of Labor
 7 Appropriation Act, 1955".

8 **TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCA-**
 9 **TION, AND WELFARE**

10 **AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND**

11 Education of the blind: For carrying out the Act of
 12 August 4, 1919, as amended (20 U. S. C. 101), ~~(12)\$175,-~~
 13 ~~000~~ \$205,000.

14 **COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF**

15 Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of Co-
 16 lumbia Institution for the Deaf, including personal services
 17 and miscellaneous expenses, and repairs and improvements,
 18 \$410,000: *Provided, That the Columbia Institution for the*
 19 *Deaf shall be paid by the District of Columbia, in advance*
 20 *at the beginning of each quarter, at the rate of \$1,295 per*
 21 *school year for each student attending said Institution*
 22 *pursuant to the Act of March 1, 1901 (31 D. C. Code*
 23 *1008).*

24 Construction: For the construction of a library-class-
 25 room building at the Columbia Institution for the Deaf

1 \$240,000, to remain available until expended; and for
2 alterations, \$19,000; in all, \$259,000.

3 FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

4 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses for
5 carrying out the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act,
6 as amended (21 U. S. C. 301-392); the Tea Importation
7 Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 41-50); the Import Milk
8 Act (21 U. S. C. 141-149); the Federal Caustic Poison
9 Act (15 U. S. C. 401-411); and the Filled Milk Act, as
10 amended (21 U. S. C. 61-64); reporting and illustrating
11 the results of investigations; purchase of chemicals, appa-
12 ratus, and scientific equipment; not to exceed \$2,000 for
13 payment in advance for special tests and analyses by con-
14 tract; and payment of fees, travel, and per diem in connection
15 with studies of new developments pertinent to food and drug
16 enforcement operations; ~~(13)\$5,100,000~~ \$5,200,000.

17 Salaries and expenses, certification and inspection serv-
18 ices: For expenses necessary for the certification or in-
19 spection of certain products in accordance with sections
20 406, 504, 506, 507, 604, 702A, and 706 of the Federal
21 Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 346,
22 354, 356, 357, 364, 372a, and 376), the aggregate of
23 the advance deposits during the current fiscal year to cover
24 payment of fees by applicants for certification or inspection
25 of such products, to remain available until expended. The

1 total amount herein appropriated shall be available for
2 personal services; purchase of chemicals, apparatus, and
3 scientific equipment; and the refund of advance deposits
4 for which no service has been rendered.

5 FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL

6 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for opera-
7 tion and maintenance, including repairs; furnishing, repair-
8 ing, and cleaning of wearing apparel used by employees in
9 the performance of their official duties; transfer of funds to
10 the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Howard Univer-
11 sity" for salaries of technical and professional personnel de-
12 tailed to the hospital; payments to the appropriation of
13 Howard University for actual cost of heat, light, and
14 power furnished by such university; \$2,880,000: *Pro-*
15 *vided*, That no intern or resident physician receiving
16 compensation from this appropriation on a full-time basis
17 shall receive compensation in the form of wages or salary
18 from any other appropriation in this title: *Provided further*,
19 That the District of Columbia shall pay by check to Freed-
20 men's Hospital, upon the Surgeon General's request, in ad-
21 vance at the beginning of each quarter, such amount as the
22 Surgeon General calculates will be earned on the basis of
23 rates approved by the Bureau of the Budget for the care
24 of patients certified by the District of Columbia. Bills ren-
25 dered by the Surgeon General on the basis of such calcula-

1 tions shall not be subject to audit or certification in advance
2 of payment; but proper adjustment of amounts which have
3 been paid in advance on the basis of such calculations shall
4 be made at the end of each quarter: *Provided further*, That
5 the Surgeon General may delegate the responsibilities im-
6 posed upon him by the foregoing proviso.

7 HOWARD UNIVERSITY

Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of Howard University, including personal services and miscellaneous expenses and repairs to buildings and grounds, \$2,720,000.

Construction of buildings: For the construction and equipment of buildings and facilities, under the supervision of the General Services Administration, on the grounds of Howard University, including engineering and architectural services and travel, to remain available until expended, as follows:

17 For a preclinical medical building, together with altera-
18 tions and installations in connection with such construction,
19 \$4,436,000.

20 For a power substation, together with necessary altera-
21 tions within the power plant, \$272,000.

22 For repairs to the power plant, \$100,000.

Construction of buildings (liquidation of contract au-
thorization) : For payment of obligations incurred under
authority previously provided, to enter into contracts for the

1 construction of the following: Biology-greenhouse building,
2 \$250,000; law building, \$200,000; and administration build-
3 ing, \$700,000.

4 OFFICE OF EDUCATION

5 Promotion and further development of vocational educa-
6 tion: For carrying out the provisions of section 3 of the
7 Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20 U. S. C. 15),
8 section 4 of the Act of March 10, 1924 (20 U. S. C. 29),
9 section 1 of the Act of March 3, 1931 (20 U. S. C. 30),
10 and the Act of March 18, 1950 (Public Law 462),
11 \$23,673,261: *Provided*, That the apportionment to the
12 States under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 shall
13 be computed on the basis of not to exceed \$23,498,261 for
14 the current fiscal year: *Provided further*, That not more
15 than \$900,000 of this appropriation shall be available for
16 vocational education in distributive occupations.

17 Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and the
18 mechanic arts: For carrying out the provisions of section
19 22 of the Act of June 29, 1935, as amended, \$2,501,500.

20 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
21 Office of Education, including surveys, studies, investiga-
22 tions, and reports regarding libraries; fostering coordina-
23 tion of public and school library service; coordination of
24 library service on the national level with other forms of
25 adult education; developing library participation in Federal

1 projects; fostering Nation-wide coordination of research
 2 materials among libraries, interstate library coordination and
 3 the development of library service throughout the country;
 4 purchase, distribution, and exchange of educational docu-
 5 ments, motion-picture films, and lantern slides; collection,
 6 exchange, and cataloging of educational apparatus and appli-
 7 ances, articles of school furniture and models of school build-
 8 ings illustrative of foreign and domestic systems and methods
 9 of education, and repairing the same; \$2,900,000, of which
 10 not less than \$480,000 shall be available for the Division
 11 of Vocational Education as authorized: *Provided*, That all
 12 receipts from non-Federal agencies representing reimburse-
 13 ment for expenses of travel of employees of the Office of
 14 Education performing advisory functions to the said agencies
 15 shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to
 16 the credit of this appropriation.

17 Payments to school districts: For payments to local
 18 educational agencies for the maintenance and operation of
 19 schools as authorized by the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public
 20 Law 874), as amended, ~~(14)\$55,000,000~~ \$58,500,000:
 21 *Provided*, That this appropriation shall also be available for
 22 carrying out the provisions of section 6 of such Act ~~(15)~~: *Pro-*
 23 *vided further, That the 3 per centum deduction provided for*
 24 *in section 3 (c) (1) of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Con-*

1 *gress, as amended, shall not take effect for any fiscal year be-*
2 *ginning prior to July 1, 1955.*

3 Assistance for school construction: For an additional
4 amount for providing school facilities and for grants to local
5 educational agencies in federally affected areas, as author-
6 ized by titles III and IV of the Act of September 23, 1950
7 (Public Law 815), as amended, including not to exceed
8 \$575,000 for necessary expenses of technical services ren-
9 dered by other agencies, \$70,000,000, to remain available
10 until expended, and of which \$12,000,000 shall be available
11 for carrying out title IV of said Act: *Provided*, That no part
12 of this appropriation shall be available for salaries or other
13 direct expenses of the Department of Health, Education,
14 and Welfare: *Provided further*, That the sum of \$125,000
15 made available for "technical services rendered by other
16 agencies" under this head in Public Law 357, 83d Congress.
17 shall remain available through June 30, 1955.

18 OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

19 Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and
20 Puerto Rico): For payments to States (including Alaska,
21 Hawaii, and Puerto Rico) in accordance with the Vocational
22 Rehabilitation Act, as amended (29 U. S. C., ch. 4) in-
23 cluding payments, in accordance with regulations of the

1 Secretary, for one-half of necessary expenditures for the
2 acquisition of vending stands or other equipment in accord-
3 ance with section 3 (a) (3) (C) of said Act for the use of
4 blind persons, such stands or other equipment to be
5 controlled by the State agency, \$23,000,000, of which
6 not to exceed \$195,000 shall be available to the Sec-
7 retary for providing rehabilitation services to disabled
8 residents of the District of Columbia, as authorized by
9 section 6 of said Act, which latter amount shall be avail-
10 able for administrative expenses in connection with providing
11 such services in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That not
12 to exceed 15 per centum of the appropriation shall be
13 used for administrative purposes: *Provided further*, That
14 the funds herein appropriated shall be made available to
15 the States in accordance with the provisions of section 3 (a)
16 of Public Law 113 (Seventy-eighth Congress) approved
17 July 6, 1943.

18 Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and
19 Puerto Rico), next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after
20 May 31, of the current fiscal year, payments to States in
21 accordance with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as
22 amended (including the objects specified in the preceding
23 paragraph), for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal
24 year such sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred
25 and the expenditures made thereunder to be charged to the

1 appropriation therefor for that fiscal year: *Provided*, That
 2 the payments made pursuant to this paragraph shall not
 3 exceed the amount paid to the States for the first quarter of
 4 the current fiscal year.

5 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary in carry-
 6 ing out the provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act,
 7 as amended, and of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (20
 8 U. S. C., ch. 6A), including not to exceed \$3,000 for pro-
 9 duction, purchase, and distribution of educational films;
 10 ~~(16)\$620,000~~ \$650,000.

11 PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

12 For necessary expenses in carrying out the Public Health
 13 Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 6A) (herein-
 14 after referred to as the Act), and other Acts, including
 15 expenses for active commissioned officers in the Reserve
 16 Corps and for not to exceed one thousand five hundred com-
 17 missioned officers in the Regular Corps, ~~(17)~~ *and expenses for*
 18 *primary and secondary schooling for dependents of per-*
 19 *sonnel of the service stationed outside the continental limits*
 20 *of the United States in amounts not exceeding \$235 per*
 21 *student when the Surgeon General finds that schools avail-*
 22 *able in the locality are unable to provide adequately for the*
 23 *education of such dependents*, as follows:

24 Assistance to States, general: To carry out the pur-
 25 poses, not otherwise specifically provided for, of section 314

1 (c) of the Act; to provide consultative services to States
2 pursuant to section 311 of the Act; to make field investiga-
3 tions and demonstrations pursuant to section 301 of the
4 Act; to provide for collecting and compiling mortality,
5 morbidity, and vital statistics; and not to exceed \$1,000
6 for entertainment of officials of other countries when specifi-
7 cally authorized by the Surgeon General; \$13,000,000, of
8 which not more than \$2,400,000 shall be available for
9 personal services.

10 Venereal diseases: To carry out the purposes of sections
11 314 (a) and 363 of the Act with respect to venereal diseases
12 including the operation and maintenance of centers for the
13 diagnosis and treatment of persons afflicted with venereal
14 diseases; and for grants of money, services, supplies, equip-
15 ment, and use of facilities to States, as defined in the Act.
16 and with the approval of the respective State health author-
17 ities, to counties, health districts, and other political sub-
18 divisions of the States, for the foregoing purposes, in such
19 amounts and upon such terms and conditions as the Surgeon
20 General may determine; \$3,000,000.

21 Tuberculosis: To carry out the purposes of section 314
22 (b) of the Act, \$6,000,000 (18), *of which not less than*
23 *\$4,500,000 shall be available only for grants to States, to*
24 *be matched by an equal amount of State and local funds*
25 *expended for the same purpose, for direct expenses of case-*

1 *finding projects including salaries, fees, and travel of person-*
 2 *nel directly engaged in case finding and the necessary equip-*
 3 *ment and supplies used directly in prevention and case-finding*
 4 *operations, but excluding the purchase of care in hospitals*
 5 *and sanatoria.*

6 Communicable diseases: To carry out, except as other-
 7 wise provided for, those provisions of sections 301, 311, and
 8 361 of the Act relating to the prevention and suppression
 9 of communicable and preventable diseases, and the inter-
 10 state transmission and spread thereof, including the purchase,
 11 erection, and maintenance of portable buildings; and hire,
 12 maintenance, and operation of aircraft; \$4,300,000.

13 Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene: For
 14 expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary to carry out
 15 those provisions of sections 301, 311, 314 (c), and 361 of
 16 the Act relating to sanitation and other aspects of environ-
 17 mental health, including enforcement of applicable quaran-
 18 tine laws and interstate quarantine regulations, and for carry-
 19 ing out the purposes of the Water Pollution Control Act (33
 20 U. S. C. 466-466 (j)) ; ~~(19)\$3,295,000~~ \$3,565,000, of
 21 which not less than \$270,000 shall be available only for
 22 completing construction of the Robert A. Taft Sanitary
 23 Engineering Center, Cincinnati, Ohio.

24 Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Ter-

1 ritory of Alaska: To enable the Surgeon General to conduct,
 2 in the Service, and to cooperate with and assist the Territory
 3 of Alaska in the conduct of, activities necessary in the
 4 investigation, prevention, treatment, and control of diseases,
 5 and the establishment and maintenance of health and sani-
 6 tation services pursuant to and for the purposes specified in
 7 sections 301, 311, 314 (without regard to the provisions of
 8 subsections (d), (f), (h), and (j) and the limitations set
 9 forth in subsection (c) of such section), 361 and 363 of the
 10 Act, including the hire, operation, and maintenance of air-
 11 craft, and the purchase, erection, and maintenance of port-
 12 able buildings, \$1,125,000 ~~(20)~~, of which not less than
 13 ~~\$160,000~~ shall be available only for the activation and
 14 operation of the two immobilized marine health units
 15 "Health" and "Hygiene".

16 Grants for hospital construction: For payments for
 17 hospital construction under part C, title VI, of the Act, as
 18 amended, to remain available until expended, \$75,000,000:
 19 *Provided*, That allotments under such part C to the several
 20 States for the current fiscal year shall be made on the basis
 21 of an amount equal to the appropriation granted herein.

22 Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services:
 23 For salaries and expenses incident to carrying out title VI
 24 of the Act, as amended, ~~(21)\$750,000~~ \$950,000.

25 Hospitals and medical care: For carrying out the func-

1 tions of the Public Health Service under the Act of August
2 8, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 150), and under sections 321, 322, 324,
3 326, 331, 332, 341, 343, 344, 502, 504, and 710 of the
4 Public Health Service Act, and Executive Order 9079 of
5 February 26, 1942, including purchase and exchange of
6 farm products and livestock; conducting research on tech-
7 nical nursing standards and furnishing consultative nursing
8 services; and purchase of firearms and ammunition;
9 \$33,000,000, of which \$1,000,000 shall be exclusively
10 available for payments to the Territory of Hawaii for care
11 and treatment of person afflicted with leprosy: *Provided*,
12 That when the Public Health Service establishes or operates
13 a health service program for any department or agency,
14 payment for the estimated cost shall be made in advance for
15 deposit to the credit of this appropriation.

16 Foreign quarantine service: For carrying out the pur-
17 poses of sections 361 to 369 of the Act, relating to prevent-
18 ing the introduction of communicable diseases from foreign
19 countries, the medical examination of aliens in accordance
20 with section 325 of the Act, and the care and treatment of
21 quarantine detainees pursuant to section 322 (e) of the
22 Act in private or other public hospitals when facilities of
23 the Public Health Service are not available, including in-
24 surance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when
25 required by law of such countries; \$2,900,000.

1 National Institutes of Health, operating expenses: For
2 the activities of the National Institutes of Health, not other-
3 wise provided for, including research fellowships and grants
4 for research projects pursuant to section 301 of the Act; not
5 to exceed \$1,000 for entertainment of visiting scientists when
6 specifically approved by the Surgeon General; erection of
7 temporary structures; and grants of therapeutic and chemical
8 substances for demonstrations and research; \$4,675,000:
9 *Provided*, That the Surgeon General is authorized to advance
10 to this appropriation from other appropriations to the Public
11 Health Service such amounts as are determined to be neces-
12 sary for the foregoing purposes and for activities performed
13 on a centralized basis: *Provided further*, That the Surgeon
14 General is authorized to operate facilities at the National
15 Institutes of Health for the sale of meals to employees and
16 others at rates determined by him to be sufficient to recover
17 the cost of such operation and the proceeds thereof shall be
18 credited to this appropriation.

19 National Cancer Institute: To enable the Surgeon Gen-
20 eral, upon the recommendations of the National Advisory
21 Cancer Council, to make grants-in-aid for research and train-
22 ing projects relating to cancer; to cooperate with State health
23 agencies, and other public and private nonprofit institutions,
24 in the prevention, control, and eradication of cancer by
25 providing consultative services, demonstrations, and grants-

1 in-aid; and to otherwise carry out the provisions of title IV,
 2 part A, of the Act; ~~(22)\$21,237,000~~ \$22,737,000.

3 Mental health activities: For expenses necessary for
 4 carrying out the provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 311,
 5 312, and 314 (c) of the Act with respect to mental diseases,
 6 ~~(23)\$13,460,000~~ \$14,460,000.

7 National Heart Institute: For expenses necessary to
 8 carry out the purposes of the National Heart Act,
 9 ~~(24)\$16,168,000~~ \$17,168,000.

10 Dental health activities: For expenses not otherwise
 11 provided for, necessary to enable the Surgeon General to
 12 carry out the purposes of the Act with respect to dental
 13 diseases and conditions, ~~(25)\$1,740,000~~ \$1,990,000.

14 Arthritis and metabolic disease activities: For expenses
 15 necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act relating to
 16 arthritis, rheumatism, and metabolic diseases, ~~(26)\$7,270,-~~
 17 ~~000~~ \$9,270,000.

18 Microbiology activities: For expenses necessary to carry
 19 out the purposes of the Act relating to microbiology, in-
 20 cluding the regulation and preparation of biologic products,
 21 ~~(27)\$5,930,000~~ \$6,430,000.

22 Neurology and blindness activities: For expenses nec-
 23 essary to carry out the purposes of the Act relating to
 24 neurology and blindness, ~~(28)\$6,913,000~~ \$8,413,000.

25 Gorgas Memorial Laboratory: For payment to the

1 Gorgas Memorial Institute for maintenance and operation
2 of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, \$131,000.

3 Retired pay of commissioned officers: For retired pay
4 of commissioned officers, as authorized by law, and payments
5 under the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of
6 1953, \$1,141,000.

7 Salaries and expenses: For the divisions and offices of
8 the Office of the Surgeon General and for miscellaneous
9 expenses of the Public Health Service not appropriated for
10 elsewhere, including preparing information, articles, and
11 publications related to public health; and conducting studies
12 and demonstrations in public health methods; \$2,780,000.

13 Administrative provisions: During the current fiscal
14 year, and with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget,
15 there may be transferred from any annual appropriation
16 to the Public Health Service to any other such appropria-
17 tion such additional amounts as may be required for pay
18 and allowances of the active commissioned officers herein
19 authorized, but any amounts so transferred shall not exceed
20 5 per centum of any such appropriation and no such appro-
21 priation shall be increased by more than 5 per centum as a
22 result of any such transfers.

23 SAINT ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

24 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
25 maintenance and operation of the hospital, including pur-

1 chase of clothing for patients and cooperation with organiza-
 2 tions or individuals in the scientific research into the nature,
 3 causes, prevention and treatment of mental illness, \$2,445,-
 4 000.

5 Major repairs and preservation of buildings and
 6 grounds: For miscellaneous construction, alterations, repairs,
 7 and equipment, on the grounds of the hospital, including
 8 preparation of plans and specifications, advertising, and
 9 supervision of construction, \$709,000: *Provided*, That any
 10 part of this amount may be transferred to the General
 11 Services Administration(29): *Provided further, That the*
 12 *services financed by this appropriation shall be included in the*
 13 *term "care" as used in section 2 of the Act of August 4, 1947*
 14 *(24 U. S. C. 168a).*

15 (30)Construction, maximum security building: For the prepa-
 16 ration of tentative drawings for a maximum security build-
 17 ing at Saint Elizabeths Hospital, \$110,000: *Provided, That*
 18 *with respect to construction of new facilities hereafter author-*
 19 *ized the per diem rate calculated for the District of Columbia*
 20 *pursuant to section 2 of the Act of August 4, 1947 (24*
 21 *U. S. C. 168a), shall include a proportionate share of the*
 22 *annual increment of the depreciated total cost of such con-*
 23 *struction, such depreciation to be based on the estimated life,*
 24 *not exceeding forty years, of such construction, to be deter-*
 25 *mined by the Board of Commissioners of the District of*

1 *Columbia, beginning with the fiscal year following completion*
 2 *of construction, and such proportionate share shall be de-*
 3 *posited in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.*

4 SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

5 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors
 6 Insurance: For necessary expenses, including furnishing,
 7 repairing, and cleaning of wearing apparel and equipment
 8 used by building guards; not more than ~~(31)~~\$64,150,000
 9 \$64,650,000 may be expended from the Federal old-age and
 10 survivors insurance trust fund ~~(32)~~: *Provided, That the Sec-*
 11 *retary of Health, Education, and Welfare hereafter is author-*
 12 *ized, subject to the procedures prescribed by section 505 of the*
 13 *Classification Act of 1949, to place the position of Director,*
 14 *Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, in grade*
 15 *GS-18 in the General Schedule established by the Classifi-*
 16 *cation Act of 1949, and such position shall be in addition*
 17 *to those positions in the Department of Health, Education,*
 18 *and Welfare presently allocated in grade GS-18: Provided*
 19 *further, That this proviso shall be effective only upon enact-*
 20 *ment into law, during the second session of the Eighty-third*
 21 *Congress, of S. 2665: Provided further, That the position*
 22 *described herein shall be allocated to the numerical limitations*
 23 *contained in S. 2665.*

24 Grants to States for public assistance: For grants to
 25 States for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid

1 to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled,
 2 as authorized in titles I, IV, X, and XIV of the Social
 3 Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subchs. I, IV,
 4 X, and XIV) , \$1,200,000,000, of which such amount as may
 5 be necessary shall be available for grants for any period in
 6 the prior fiscal year subsequent to March 31 of that year.

7 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance: For
 8 expenses necessary for the Bureau of Public Assistance,
 9 ~~(33)\$1,450,000~~ \$1,550,000.

10 Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau: For necessary
 11 expenses in carrying out the Act of April 9, 1912, as
 12 amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 6), and title V of the Social
 13 Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V) ,
 14 including purchase of reports and material for the publica-
 15 tions of the Children's Bureau and of reprints for distribution,
 16 \$1,525,000: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation
 17 contained in this title shall be used to promulgate or carry
 18 out any instructions, order, or regulation relating to the care
 19 of obstetrical cases which discriminate between persons
 20 licensed under State law to practice obstetrics: *Provided*
 21 *further*, That the foregoing proviso shall not be so construed
 22 as to prevent any patient from having the services of any
 23 practitioner of her own choice, paid for out of this fund, so
 24 long as State laws are complied with: *Provided further*,
 25 That any State plan which provides standards for professional

1 obstetrical services in accordance with the laws of the State
2 shall be approved.

3 Grants to States for maternal and child welfare: For
4 grants to States for maternal and child-health services, serv-
5 ices for crippled children, and child-welfare services as
6 authorized in title V, parts 1, 2, and 3, of the Social Security
7 Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V), \$30,000,-
8 000: *Provided*, That any allotment to a State pursuant to
9 section 502 (b) or 512 (b) of such Act shall not be included
10 in computing for the purposes of subsections (a) and (b) of
11 sections 504 and 514 of such Act an amount expended or
12 estimated to be expended by the State.

13 Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner: For
14 expenses necessary for the Office of the Commissioner of
15 Social Security, \$173,000, together with not to exceed
16 \$123,500 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and
17 survivors insurance trust fund.

18 Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For mak-
19 ing, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to
20 States under titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV, respectively, of
21 the Social Security Act, as amended, for the first quarter of
22 the next succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may be neces-
23 sary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures made
24 thereunder for payments under each of such titles to be
25 charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year.

1 In the administration of titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV,
 2 respectively, of the Social Security Act, as amended, pay-
 3 ments to a State under any of such titles for any quarter
 4 in the period beginning April 1 of the prior year, and ending
 5 June 30 of the current year, may be made with respect to a
 6 State plan approved under such title prior to or during such
 7 period, but no such payment shall be made with respect to
 8 any plan for any quarter prior to the quarter in which such
 9 plan was submitted for approval.

10 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

11 Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary: For ex-
 12 penses necessary for the Office of the Secretary, ~~(34)~~\$1,075,-
 13 ~~000~~ \$1,150,000, together with not to exceed \$171,000 to be
 14 transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance
 15 trust fund ~~(35):~~ *Provided*, That not more than \$200,000
 16 additional may be transferred to this head from other appro-
 17 priations.

18 Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Services: For
 19 expenses necessary for the Office of Field Services,
 20 including not less than \$850,000 for the Division of Grant-
 21 in-Aid Audits, ~~(36)~~\$1,775,000 \$1,835,000, together with
 22 not to exceed \$350,000 to be transferred from the Federal
 23 old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

24 Salaries and expenses, Office of the General Counsel: For
 25 expenses necessary for the Office of the General Counsel,

1 \$350,000, together with not to exceed \$22,500 to be trans-
 2 ferred from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, certifi-
 3 cation and inspection services", and not to exceed \$365,000
 4 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors in-
 5 surance trust fund.

6 Surplus property disposal: For expenses necessary for
 7 carrying out the provisions of subsections 203 (j) and (k)
 8 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act
 9 of 1949, as amended, relating to disposal of real and personal
 10 excess property for educational purposes and protection of
 11 public health, \$400,000.

12 **(37)***Working capital fund: The working capital fund estab-*
 13 *lished in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act,*
 14 *1953 (66 Stat. 369), shall be available for financing the*
 15 *additional functions of central accounting service and central*
 16 *internal audit service.*

17 GENERAL PROVISIONS

18 SEC. 202. Appropriations under this title available for
 19 salaries and expenses shall be available for payment in
 20 advance for dues or fees for library membership in organiza-
 21 tions whose publications are available to members only or to
 22 members at a price lower than to the general public.

23 SEC. 203. Appropriations under this title available for
 24 salaries and expenses shall be available for services as

1 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5
2 U. S. C. 55a).

3 SEC. 204. Appropriations under this title available for
4 salaries and expenses shall be available for travel expenses
5 and not to exceed ~~(38)\$75,000~~ \$105,000, of which \$45,000
6 shall be available only to the National Institutes of Health, of
7 such funds shall be available for expenses of attendance at
8 meetings concerned with the functions or activities for which
9 such appropriations are made.

10 SEC. 205. None of the funds appropriated by this title
11 to the Social Security Administration for grants in aid of
12 State agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of
13 operation of said agencies including the salaries and expenses
14 of officers and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld
15 from the said agencies of any States which have established
16 by legislative enactment and have in operation a merit sys-
17 tem and classification and compensation plan covering the
18 selection, tenure in office, and compensation of their em-
19 ployees, because of any disapproval of their personnel or
20 the manner of their selection by the agencies of the said
21 States, or the rates of pay of said officers or employees.

22 SEC. 206. The Secretary is authorized to make such
23 transfers of motor vehicles, between bureaus and offices,

1 without transfer of funds, as may be required in carrying
2 out the operations of the Department.

3 **(39)***SEC. 207. In order to more effectively administer the*
4 *programs and functions of the Department, the Secretary*
5 *is authorized to transfer not to exceed 1 per centum of any*
6 *appropriation in this title available for salaries and expenses*
7 *to any other such appropriation but no such appropriation*
8 *shall be increased by more than 1 per centum by any such*
9 *transfer: Provided, That no such transfers shall be used for*
10 *the creation of new functions within the Department, nor*
11 *shall the total amount transferred in fiscal year 1955 exceed*
12 *\$100,000.*

13 This title may be cited as the "Department of Health,
14 Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1955".

15 TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

16 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
17 National Labor Relations Board to carry out the functions
18 vested in it by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947
19 (29 U. S. C. 141-167), and other laws, including expenses
20 of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the
21 Board when specifically authorized by the Chairman or the
22 General Counsel; and services as authorized by section
23 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a);
24 \$8,400,000: *Provided, That no part of this appropriation*

1 shall be available to organize or assist in organizing agricul-
 2 tural laborers or used in connection with investigations, hear-
 3 ings, directives, or orders concerning bargaining units com-
 4 posed of agricultural laborers as referred to in section 2 (3)
 5 of the Act of July 5, 1935 (49 Stat. 450), and as amended
 6 by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and as
 7 defined in section 3 (f) of the Act of June 25, 1938 (52
 8 Stat. 1060), and including in said definition employees
 9 engaged in the maintenance and operation of ditches, canals,
 10 reservoirs, and waterways when maintained or operated on
 11 a mutual, nonprofit basis and at least 95 per centum of the
 12 water stored or supplied thereby is used for farming pur-
 13 poses.

14 This title may be cited as the "National Labor
 15 Relations Board Appropriation Act, 1955".

16 TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

17 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
 18 National Mediation Board, including stenographic reporting
 19 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August
 20 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), ~~(40)\$422,000~~ \$429,000.

21 Arbitration and emergency boards: For expenses neces-
 22 sary for arbitration boards established under section 7 of
 23 the Railway Labor Act, as amended (45 U. S. C. 157),
 24 and emergency boards appointed by the President pursuant

1 to section 10 of said Act (45 U. S. C. 160), including
2 stenographic reporting services as authorized by section 15
3 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$300,000.

4 NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

5 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
6 National Railroad Adjustment Board, including stenographic
7 reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
8 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$495,000, of which not
9 less than \$175,000 shall be available for compensation (at
10 rates not in excess of \$75 per diem) and expenses of referees
11 appointed pursuant to section 3 of the Railway Labor Act,
12 as amended.

13 This title may be cited as the "National Mediation
14 Board Appropriation Act, 1955".

15 TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

16 Salaries and expenses, Railroad Retirement Board (trust
17 fund) : For expenses necessary for the Railroad Retirement
18 Board, including not to exceed \$1,000 for expenses of attend-
19 ance at meetings concerned with the work of the Board, when
20 specifically authorized by the Board; and stenographic re-
21 porting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
22 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; \$6,108,000, to be derived
23 from the railroad retirement account.

24 This title may be cited as the "Railroad Retirement Board
25 Appropriation Act, 1955".

TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND
CONCILIATION SERVICE

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Service to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 171–180, 182), including expenses of the Labor-Management Panel as provided in section 205 of said Act; temporary employment of arbitrators, conciliators, and mediators on labor relations at rates not in excess of \$75 per diem; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with labor and industrial relations; and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; \$3,124,000.

Boards of inquiry: To enable the Service to pay necessary expenses of boards of inquiry appointed by the President pursuant to section 206 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 176–180, 182), including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and rent in the District of Columbia, \$10,000.

This title may be cited as the “Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service Appropriation Act, 1955”.

TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the

1 United States or who is a member of an organization of Gov-
2 ernment employees that asserts the right to strike against
3 the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or
4 is a member of an organization that advocates, the over-
5 throw of the Government of the United States by force or
6 violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit
7 shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person
8 making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this
9 section engaged in a strike against the Government of the
10 United States, is not a member of an organization of Gov-
11 ernment employees that asserts the right to strike against
12 the Government of the United States, or that such person
13 does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization
14 that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the
15 United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That
16 any person who engages in a strike against the Government
17 of the United States, or who is a member of an organization
18 of Government employees that asserts the right to strike
19 against the Government of the United States, or who advo-
20 cates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates,
21 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by
22 force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages
23 for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this

1 Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be
2 fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than
3 one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty
4 clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any
5 other provisions of existing law.

6 SEC. 702. No part of any appropriation contained in this
7 Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not
8 authorized by the Congress.

9 SEC. 703. No part of any appropriation contained in this
10 Act shall be used to pay compensation of any employee
11 engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that
12 would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one
13 hundred and five, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and
14 intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided*,
15 That for purposes of this section employees shall be con-
16 sidered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time
17 or more in personnel administration consisting of direction
18 and administration of the personnel program; employment,
19 placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification;
20 employee relations and services; training; committees of
21 expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage
22 administration; and processing, recording, and reporting.

23 This Act may be cited as the "Departments of Labor,

1 and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act,
2 1955.”

Passed the House of Representatives June 10, 1954.

Attest: LYLE O. SNADER,
Clerk.

Passed the Senate with amendments June 25 (legislative
day, June 22), 1954.

Attest: J. MARK TRICE,
Secretary.

83^d CONGRESS
2^d Session

H. R. 9447

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 25, 1954

**Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the
Senate numbered**

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I offered an amendment to the conference report which was just agreed to. The amendment was not agreed to by the conference committee. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, following the acceptance of the conference report, a statement with respect to the amendment.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] in taking the amendment for proper treatment of foreign currency collections by military agencies to the conference on the defense appropriation bill.

I am sorry the Senate conferees had to give in on it, but I suppose I can understand what they encountered in the conference, and I am not going to press the question or the issue at this time.

But these three observations should be made:

1. Restoration of the House language in this bill does not reduce appropriations, and the expenditure of just as much money is authorized under the language as would have been spent under the budget estimates.

2. Adoption of the House language requires reduction in the Treasury's estimate of receipts in the coming year by \$355 million.

3. The adoption of the House language authorizing direct expenditure of foreign currencies by military agencies collecting them, instead of running through the Treasury as receipts, and appropriating them out under the orderly procedure is diametrically contrary to public policy adopted by both the present administration and the preceding one; it is contrary to efforts of both the Secretary and the Director of the Budget for sound fiscal procedure.

I want to serve notice at this time that I shall oppose any further recurrence of this sort of fiscal bypass by the military, and I shall call upon the President, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Director of the Budget to back me up in the defense of their own policies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POTTER in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 8873, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
June 24, 1954.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6 and 9 to the bill (H. R. 8873) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes", and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: After the word "Amounts" in line 2 of said amendment insert ", not exceeding \$100,000,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: "Provided, That not to exceed \$18,000,000 may be transferred to this appropriation from the appropriation 'Procurement and Production, Army' for National Guard armory and non-armory construction in accordance with the act of September 11, 1950, when such

transfers are determined by the Secretary of Defense to be in the national interest: *Provided further*, That such portion of the amount so transferred as may be applied to the construction of buildings and facilities other than armories shall be without regard to the 75 per centum restriction on contributions contained in section 4 (d) of the act of September 11, 1950."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Before the period at the end of said amendment insert: ", except that the total unobligated portions of such balances so transferred and merged shall not exceed \$8,703,100."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: "Provided, That in addition, the Secretary of the Air Force may transfer not to exceed \$5,000,000 to this appropriation from any appropriation available to the Department of the Air Force which is limited for obligation to fiscal year 1955."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: "That in addition, the Secretary of the Air Force may transfer not to exceed \$9 million to this appropriation from any appropriation available to the Department of the Air Force which is limited for obligation to fiscal year 1955: *Provided further*."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: "Provided further, That no funds available to agencies of the Department of Defense shall be used for the operation, acquisition, or construction of new facilities or equipment for new facilities in the continental limits of the United States for metal scrap baling or shearing or for melting or sweating aluminum scrap unless the Secretary of Defense or an Assistant Secretary of Defense designated by him determines, with respect to each facility involved, that the operation of such facility is in the national interest."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 731½. Those appropriations or funds available to the Department of Defense or any agency thereof which would otherwise lapse for expenditure purposes on June 30, 1954, and designated by the Secretary of Defense not later than July 31, 1954, shall remain available until June 30, 1955, to such department or agency solely for expenditure for the liquidation of obligations legally incurred against such appropriation during the period for which such appropriation was legally available for obligation: *Provided*, That the Department of Defense shall make a review of all contracts entered into under such appropriations or funds and outstanding on June 30, 1954, and report to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives by January 31, 1955 (a) the total value of contracts canceled, (b) the total value of contracts adjusted and the resultant savings therefrom, and (c) the total value of contracts continued on the basis of determined need: *Provided further*, That any such contract shall be terminated no later than June 30, 1955, unless the Secretary of the Department concerned certifies prior to January 1, 1955, that continuation is necessary for reasons of economy or in the national interest."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Change the section number from "739" to "738."

Mr. FERGUSON. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 5, 13, 18, 19, 22, 28, and 35. The motion was agreed to.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1955

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9447) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I call up an amendment which I have proposed to H. R. 9447.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is advised that his amendment will not be in order until after the committee amendments have been acted upon.

PUBLIC HOUSING PROGRAMS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter which I, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, have written to the Honorable Albert M. Cole, Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, requesting certain information with respect to the public housing programs.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 18, 1954.

HON. ALBERT M. COLE,
Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D. C.
MY DEAR MR. COLE: As chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, and acting under authority of section 601 of the Revenue Act of 1941, I am requesting at your earliest convenience the following information with respect to the Public Housing Act program:

1. The total number of housing units authorized in basic legislation since the inception of the program.
2. The total number of units constructed since the inception of the program.
3. The number of units authorized but not yet constructed.
4. The number of vacant units by the latest available report.
5. The total amount of lending authority for the program; the total amount loaned, the total outstanding as of the latest available report, total interest paid to Treasury, and the total amount of interest paid to PHA.
6. The total of all contributions paid since the inception of the program.
7. The total of administrative expenses since the inception of the program.
8. A statement as to the extent that the public-housing program is relative, competitive, or independent with respect to any one or more FHA programs, the slum-clearance program, and the college-housing program, and all other programs under HHFA.
9. A statement with respect to the autonomy in which local housing operates.

10. A statement as to the extent of supervision and audit exercised by PHA over housing projects and local authorities.

Very truly yours,

HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman.

FUNDS RECEIVED FROM GERMANY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter dated June 22, 1954, addressed to me by Lyle

S. Garlock, Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense, together with a statement of funds received from Germany.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., June 22, 1954.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: Attached for your information is the latest quarterly report on

deutschemark support received by agencies of the Department of Defense from the Federal Republic of Germany and the Berlin Magistrat. Obligations and expenditures are shown in dollar equivalents for the first 3 quarters of fiscal year 1954, and are arranged by comparable United States appropriation accounts.

Sincerely yours,

LYLE S. GARLOCK,
Acting Assistant Secretary of
Defense (Comptroller).

Department of Defense summary report on standard form 133 basis of the dollar equivalent of deutschemark support received from the Federal Republic of Germany and the Berlin Magistrat for occupation costs and mandatory expenditures based on allocations to the Department of Defense by the High Commissioner for Germany, fiscal year 1954, through Mar. 31, 1954

SECTION I—OBLIGATIONAL STATUS

Military department and comparable United States appropriation account	Total amount available for obligation	Obligations				Unobligated balance Mar. 31, 1954	Unpaid obligations Mar. 31, 1954
		1st quarter	2d quarter	3d quarter	Cumulative		
Department of Defense:							
Federal Republic of Germany.....	756,035,166	79,971,914	274,519,691	79,400,753	433,892,358	322,142,808	285,578,014
Berlin Magistrat.....	14,286,821		6,350,142	7,297,390	13,647,532	639,289	8,187,956
Total, Department of Defense.....	770,321,987	79,971,914	280,869,833	86,698,143	447,539,890	322,782,097	293,766,870
Department of the Army:							
Federal Republic of Germany:							
Military personnel, Army.....	9,303,000	310,978	2,435,980	4,170,242	6,917,200	2,385,800	4,897,665
Maintenance and operation, Army.....	320,482,000	64,591,326	100,320,393	54,476,497	219,388,216	101,093,784	92,773,405
Procurement and production.....	10,369,000		369,048	224,725	593,773	9,775,227	593,773
Military construction, Army.....	247,086,000	271,305	100,329,337	10,081,510	110,682,152	136,403,848	104,562,303
Reserve personnel requirements, Army.....	2,000		841	92	933	1,067	911
Reserve for settlement of claims.....							
Claims, Department of the Army.....	2,005,000		1,085,232	465,772	1,551,004	453,996	302,788
Preparation for sale or salvage of military property.....	15,000	2,491	3,087	3,732	9,310	5,690	2,381
Undistributed.....							
Subtotal, Federal Republic of Germany.....	589,262,000	65,176,100	204,543,918	69,422,570	339,142,588	250,119,412	203,133,226
Berlin Magistrat:							
Military personnel, Army.....	45,200		28,527	13,729	42,256	2,044	9,173
Maintenance and operation, Army.....	8,317,447		4,985,803	3,331,133	8,316,936	511	3,335,500
Military construction, Army.....	4,523,809		945,212	3,484,542	4,429,754	94,055	4,418,913
Reserve for settlement of claims.....							
Claims, Department of the Army.....	140,409		2,835	9,070	11,905	128,504	8,674
Subtotal, Department of the Army.....	13,026,865		5,962,377	6,838,474	12,800,851	226,014	7,772,260
Total, Department of the Army.....	602,288,865	65,176,100	210,506,295	76,261,044	351,943,439	250,345,426	210,905,486
Department of the Navy:							
Federal Republic of Germany:							
Ships and facilities, Navy.....	6,189,192	614,797	2,420,708	1,051,495	4,087,000	2,102,192	1,883,444
Navy industrial fund.....	859,000	212,723	224,132	162,237	599,092	259,908	79,780
Total, Department of the Navy.....	7,048,192	827,520	2,644,840	1,213,732	4,686,092	2,362,100	1,963,224
Department of the Air Force:							
Federal Republic of Germany:							
Major procurement other than aircraft.....	8,463,018		4,143,025	-63,590	4,079,435	4,383,583	3,761,471
Acquisition and construction of real property.....	60,568,200	2,640,058	30,449,438	28,102	33,117,598	27,450,602	45,902,049
Maintenance and operation.....	88,962,000	11,156,361	32,418,898	8,839,105	52,414,364	36,547,636	30,558,769
Military personnel requirements.....	1,166,756	115,816	190,834	124,842	431,492	735,264	219,278
Claims.....	150,000	56,059	128,738	-164,008	20,789	129,211	40,897
Contingencies.....	415,000					415,000	
Subtotal, Federal Republic of Germany.....	159,724,974	13,968,294	67,330,933	8,764,451	90,063,678	69,661,296	80,482,464
Berlin Magistrat:							
Acquisition and construction of real property.....	212,370			207,771	207,771	4,599	207,771
Maintenance and operation.....	1,047,586		387,765	251,145	638,910	408,676	207,925
Subtotal, Berlin Magistrat.....	1,259,956		387,765	458,916	846,681	413,275	415,696
Total, Department of the Air Force.....	160,984,930	13,968,294	67,718,698	9,223,367	90,910,359	70,074,571	80,898,160

SECTION II—OBLIGATIONAL STATUS

Military Department and comparable United States appropriation account	Total amount available for expenditure	Expenditures				Unexpended balance, Mar. 31, 1954
		1st quarter	2d quarter	3d quarter	Cumulative	
Department of Defense:						
Federal Republic of Germany.....	835,089,759	37,935,191	69,916,676	119,622,988	227,474,855	607,614,904
Berlin Magistrat.....	14,391,197		3,346,678	2,217,274	5,563,952	8,827,245
Total, Department of Defense.....	849,480,956	37,935,191	73,263,354	121,840,262	233,038,807	616,442,149
Department of the Army:						
Federal Republic of Germany:						
Military Personnel, Army.....	10,449,397	117,068	688,241	2,360,623	3,165,932	7,283,465
Maintenance and Operation, Army.....	354,512,953	30,294,675	51,009,204	79,341,885	160,645,764	193,867,189
Procurement and production.....	10,369,000					10,369,000
Military construction, Army.....	261,821,340		1,549,864	19,305,325	20,855,189	240,966,151
Reserve personnel requirements, Army.....	2,000					1,978
Reserve for settlement of claims.....						
Claims, Department of the Army.....	2,340,936		953,231	630,921	1,584,152	756,784
Preparation for sale or salvage of military property.....	16,364	1,526	3,040	3,727	8,293	8,071
Subtotal, Federal Republic of Germany.....	639,511,990	30,413,269	54,203,584	101,642,499	186,259,352	453,252,638

KNOWLAND called up Senate Concurrent Resolution 91. I stated at that time that I was in favor of it and intended to vote for it. The RECORD of today's proceedings will so indicate.

It so happened that at the time the roll was called I was in my office with a fine New Mexico constituent. I do not know whether there was a mechanical defect or not, but the bell did not ring in my office. I received a telephone call from the cloakroom informing me that the vote was in progress. I came from the Senate Office Building with the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Missouri.

I ask that my statement appear in the RECORD immediately following the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state amendments to the preamble proposed by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The first amendment was, in the second whereas, line 2, to strike out "Soviet Communists," and insert "the international Communist movement"; on line 4, to strike out "Soviet" and insert "Communist"; and on line 5, to strike out "Soviet" and insert "Communist."

The amendments were agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution and the preamble as agreed to are as follows:

Whereas for many years it has been the joint policy of the United States and the other States in the Western Hemisphere to act vigorously to prevent external interference in the affairs of the nations of the Western Hemisphere; and

Whereas in the recent past there has come to light strong evidence of intervention by the international Communist movement in the State of Guatemala, whereby government institutions have been infiltrated by Communist agents, weapons of war have been secretly shipped into that country, and the pattern of Communist conquest has become manifest; and

Whereas on Sunday, June 20, 1954, the Soviet Government vetoed in the United Nations Security Council a resolution to refer the matter of the recent outbreak of hostilities in Guatemala to the Organization of American States: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the United States should reaffirm its support of the Caracas Declaration of solidarity of March 28, 1954, which is designed to prevent interference in Western Hemisphere affairs by the international Communist movement, and take all necessary and proper steps to support the Organization of American States in taking appropriate action to prevent any interference by the international Communist movement in the affairs of the states of the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the concurrent resolution was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the motion of the Senator from Michigan be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Michigan.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1955

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9447) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, have the committee amendments been acted on?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There has been no action on any committee amendments. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. Under the heading "Title I—Department of Labor—Office of the Secretary," on page 2, line 11, after the word "public", it is proposed to strike out "\$1,300,000" and insert "\$1,354,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to a matter of personal privilege.

On June 15, 1954, on the call of the Unanimous Consent Calendar, when the bill (H. R. 8923), which had to do with a development of the Coosa River in Alabama and Georgia, came up for discussion, colloquy took place between the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH]. As appears on page 7780 of the RECORD, the senior Senator from Oregon asked the following question and there then took place the following debate:

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, may I make another inquiry of the Senator from Connecticut, the chairman of the subcommittee? Can the Senator advise as to whether there was a unanimous vote in the committee?

Mr. BUSH. There was no opposition to the bill in the committee, in the nature of any testimony in opposition to it. All the testimony was favorable.

My recollection, which is somewhat different from that of the staff director, is that there was no opposition; but I have been advised that there may have been one vote against the bill in committee.

Mr. CORDON. There was no record vote, then, I take it.

Mr. BUSH. I do not think a record vote was taken in committee, because the opposition was confined to one vote. I thought that that vote had been changed in the last analysis, but I cannot say positively that it was.

I wish to state for the RECORD the facts as to what happened at the Public Works Committee. The junior Senator from Oregon not only voted against the bill, but he spoke against the bill in the committee, and the minutes of the Public Works Committee state very clearly the opposition of the junior Senator from Oregon to the Coosa River bill. There was an official rollcall vote on the Coosa bill. The record of the committee shows very clearly that I voted against the Coosa bill on a rollcall vote. There

is not the slightest evidence in the record of the Public Works Committee which would justify the implication of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] that the junior Senator from Oregon changed his opinion or his vote on the Coosa bill.

I want the RECORD to so disclose, because it is that kind of a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which leads to the kind of smear article that appears in the Oregon press by Mr. Robert Smith, one of the correspondents for a series of Oregon newspapers. He is a correspondent who has been barred from my office for over a year, for the simple reason that I have found him so unreliable in his reporting to the people of the State of Oregon that I will not permit him in my office. My excluding him from my office is based on the simple reason that I do not intend to sit down with any newspaper correspondent who gives me a feeling that I have to keep a stenotypist in the office to make a record of any conversation I have with him. Mr. Smith has circulated in his column in the press some very interesting misrepresentations as to the position taken by the junior Senator from Oregon in regard to the Coosa bill and other matters. In fact it is a habit with him. In his column, for example, he stated:

The bill was sponsored not by the administration or its spokesman in Congress, but by Democratic Senators LISTER HILL and JOHN SPARKMAN, with whom MORSE is usually allied on the various issues before the Senate.

When it came up, MORSE left the chamber. It was passed. He returned.

Did he oppose it in the committee as he had bucked Cougar?

Senator CORDON wanted to know that, too, apparently, when he asked Chairman BUSH during debate on the Coosa bill whether the vote in committee had been unanimous.

BUSH said he understood one vote against it had been cast, but this was not recorded so it could not be checked. A committee staff member reported that MORSE had cast a vote of opposition.

But BUSH told CORDON on the floor:

"I do not think a record vote was taken in committee, because the opposition was confined to one vote. I thought that vote had been changed in the last analysis, but I cannot say positively that it was."

Mr. President, I wish to make two points. First, not only did I oppose the Coosa bill in the Public Works Committee, but I spoke against the Coosa bill in the Public Works Committee. When I came to vote on the bill, on the roll call vote in the Public Works Committee, I spoke even further against it. My colleagues will find that what I said in the Public Works Committee in explaining my negative vote at the very time I cast it, was to this effect: "I wish to say that, on this bill, I shall vote against it, because in my judgment we do not have the facts on it that we should have. Mr. Chairman, there has just been handed to the committee a report on the Coosa bill from the House of Representatives. The Senate Public Works Committee, as a committee, has not even had an opportunity to read the report. In my opinion there have not been adequate public hearings in the Senate committee on the Coosa bill. Therefore I shall vote against it."

Mr. President, the smear artist by the name of Smith, who writes a column for some Oregon newspapers seeks to leave the impression that I "ducked" on the question of voting on the Coosa bill when it reached the Senate. It is unfortunate that I was not on the floor of the Senate when that bill came up, because the Senators from Alabama know that I was opposed to that bill. But it so happens that for some weeks there has been a serious illness in my family. On that afternoon I was called from the floor of the Senate because of that illness in my family. As soon as I could return to the floor of the Senate, I did so. In the meantime the Coosa bill had been passed.

Mr. President, I do not choose to refer further to the situation of illness in my family, except to state the fact that for some weeks my wife has been in a body cast. When my absence from the Senate is required because of that situation, I shall not be in attendance in the Senate, but shall be in attendance upon my wife.

In further reference to the Coosa bill I wish to point out, Mr. President, that we need to have full and complete hearings on these so-called partnership bills. Such hearings have not been had on the Coosa bill or on the Cougar bill insofar as consideration of those bills in the Senate Committee on Public Works is concerned. I point out that there is pending at the present time the Morse bills on the Cougar Dam and on the Green Peter Dam, and that bill is sponsored by approximately 15 Members of the Senate. For the benefit of Mr. Smith, I say today, on the floor of the Senate, that I shall continue to urge that we have full and complete hearings on these bills, because in my State there are great forces representing thousands and thousands of persons who believe it would be a tremendous mistake if the Cordon-Cougar Dam bill were passed. I am convinced that a large majority of the people of Oregon favor or will favor by bills on this partnership issue once they come to understand the facts. The Public Works Committee of the Senate has not conducted thorough hearings on the Cordon-Cougar Dam bill and no hearings at all on my Cougar Dam bill.

So I ask my colleagues in the Senate to obtain all the facts regarding those bills before they come to vote.

In fairness to myself, Mr. President, I have made this statement this afternoon, first, because the statement made on June 15 on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] does not represent the facts in regard to what happened in the Public Works Committee; and second, because the statement by Mr. Smith, in seeking to imply that I "ducked" on the question of voting on the Coosa bill, is entirely incorrect.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Upton in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. If the Senator from Oregon will hand me the marked copy of the

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to which he has called my attention, I wish to say that the Senator from Oregon has a good point. I simply said:

I do not think a record vote was taken in committee, because the opposition was confined to one vote.

I think the Senator from Oregon will agree that I recalled there was one vote in opposition.

Mr. MORSE. It would have been very helpful if the Senator from Connecticut had suggested who it was who voted in opposition. Also if he had checked the record and refreshed his memory about the vote he would have recalled that there had been a record vote.

Mr. BUSH. I thought I was protecting the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Oh, Mr. President, the Senator never need worry about protecting me. I do not ask anyone for protection on any position, at any time. I shall always be willing to stand on my record.

Mr. BUSH. I shall accept the Senator's warning, and henceforth I shall not be so careful.

But I say to the Senator from Oregon that the reason I did not mention his name was that he was not on the floor, and I was not quite clear how he eventually voted.

I recalled that he had opposed the bill, but I did not wish to put him in an awkward position, I say frankly, with his friends, the Senators from Alabama, because I was not sure what his ultimate position on the matter was.

I wish to say to the Senator from Oregon that I am very, very sorry to have caused him any inconvenience or embarrassment, and I am perfectly willing to apologize, if he thinks that is necessary.

Mr. MORSE. Let me assure the Senator from Connecticut that I never ask for apologies. In my opinion, apologies are just matters of formality, anyway. They never right a wrong.

Mr. BUSH. In my judgment they are not entirely that; sometimes they are called for.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Oregon imputes that I had any intention of harming him or misrepresenting him, I wish to say that certainly was not the case. There was never any such intention. Indeed, I tried to be rather careful, and I thought I was being careful, not to put him in an embarrassing position.

I assure the Senator from Oregon that is my explanation of the matter.

I am very glad the Senator from Oregon has brought up this matter; I do not like to have things of that sort carried around under cover, and I am very glad he has brought it up. I can say absolutely to the Senate and to the Senator from Oregon that I had no intention of misquoting him or misrepresenting him. My only intention was to protect him. Perhaps I should have mentioned his name in connection with the debate on the Coosa bill. I see now that I should have done so. But I wish to make very clear that my only intention was to protect the Senator from Oregon because he was not then on the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Connecticut for his statement, which bears out my statement of the facts in connection with the proceedings in the Public Works Committee.

I wish to state that the statement he made on July 15, to the effect that it was his understanding that the vote in opposition in the committee had been changed, was a mistaken statement on his part, because at no time was my vote in the committee modified any way whatsoever. The official record of the committee was available to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], and I regret that he did not refer to it accurately on June 15.

Let me say to the Senator from Connecticut that he never has to be concerned about protecting me with my so-called liberal friends, or anyone else. My liberal friends know me well enough to know that when I disagree with them on a particular point I never hesitate to oppose them, either in committee or on the floor of the Senate. I think that on this case my liberal friends were on the wrong side of the issue. But I wish to say they knew I was opposed to their bill. I respected the honesty and sincerity of their position, but I disagreed with them, and opposed their views.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I wish to say that the distinguished Senator from Oregon came to the Senator from Alabama and said to the Senator from Alabama, "I am opposed to this bill. I have opposed it; and I voted against it this morning in the Public Works Committee." That was the day when the Senator from Oregon had opposed the bill and had voted against it.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] for confirming my opposition to his bill. Mr. President, I also wish to say to the Senator from Connecticut that, so far as he is concerned, I have made this statement, that involves him, for the purpose of correcting the RECORD, for I knew he would wish to have the RECORD corrected.

I have made the statement also because it gives me, once again, an opportunity to illustrate to the people of my State that when they read the Smith column in the Oregon newspapers, they should take it with a grain of salt, because they should take into consideration the motivation of this correspondent who writes for a group of Oregon newspapers. Insofar as the junior Senator from Oregon is concerned, Mr. Smith simply cannot get it out of his craw that he is denied admission to my office. He will continue to be denied admission to my office because of the kind of smear stuff and inaccuracies that is spread in his column is typical of his writings generally, when it comes to the junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish to say the same thing that my colleague, the senior

Senator from Alabama, has said. The distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] came to me personally and stated his views on this measure, and I had an opportunity to discuss it briefly with him.

I am in thorough sympathy and I am fully in accord with his views, as he has frequently expressed them here on the floor of the Senate, with reference to the situation in his area and the power development there.

Although I was not successful in making the distinguished Senator from Oregon agree with me about the Coosa bill, yet I do not believe that the Coosa situation and the situation in Oregon are at all parallel. For the benefit of the record, I should like to state, if I may, several things that I think differentiate those situations. One is that the Coosa River has no public development whatsoever on it. However, it does have dams and installations which were put there by the Alabama Power Co., and which have been operated by the power company for many years.

Second, there is no partnership involvement whatsoever. The entire project is to be a private enterprise project, operated by the Alabama Power Co.

Third, it is an operation in a territory which is served exclusively by the Alabama Power Co., so there is no conflict as between public and private interests.

Furthermore, it is a development which lies wholly within one State, the State of Alabama. I believe it is well to have the RECORD show the facts which serve to differentiate this project from many projects in other parts of the country.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Alabama for his comments. The point of view he has expressed with regard to Coosa Dam is the point of view which he expressed in conference with me and a point of view which was expressed before the Public Works Committee. It is a point of view with respect to which we have an honest difference of opinion. I certainly respect his sincerity and his point of view but I do not agree with him.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1955

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9447) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after the previous committee amendment, to strike out the comma and "of which not more than \$60,000 shall be for international labor affairs."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, at the beginning of line 11, to strike out "\$665,000" and insert "\$680,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, what happened to the amendment on page 3, line 11?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the chairman of the subcommittee was not aware that that amendment had been agreed to. If it is the announcement of the Chair that the amendment has been agreed to, I respectfully ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the committee amendment on page 3, line 11, was agreed to be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "\$680,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$780,000."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, there is an additional section of the Amendment that I should like to have stated also.

The CHIEF CLERK. The second amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky is, on page 2, line 24, after the semicolon, to insert the following "not to exceed \$100,000 for improving the conditions of migratory labor."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment just stated is not an amendment to the committee amendment but to the bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] has proposed an identical or similar amendment, and with his consent I should like to have him joined as a cosponsor of my amendment if it is satisfactory to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from New York will be added as a cosponsor of the amendment. The Chair states that the second amendment, on page 2, offered by the Senator from Kentucky, is an amendment to the bill, not to the committee amendment. Unanimous consent is necessary for its consideration at this time.

Mr. COOPER. I ask unanimous consent that it may be considered at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky give us an explanation of his amendment? What is the purpose of it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Reserving my right to object, I should like to have a statement on the amendment.

Mr. COOPER. The purpose of the amendment is to place in the bill \$100,000 for the Bureau of Labor Standards, to be used as a beginning of an action program to improve the conditions of migratory labor within the United States. It has nothing to do with labor forces which are brought in from without the United States, such as Mexican labor. It is a program which has been twice proposed by President Eisenhower,

and proposed by the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Mitchell.

If the Senator from Texas desires, I can elaborate on its at this time, but at the moment all I am asking is unanimous consent that the amendment be considered, and that the second part of the amendment, which describes the purpose of the \$100,000 also be considered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the purpose of my inquiry is to ascertain if the amendment proposed to be offered by the Senator from Kentucky is the amendment in which several citizens of my State are interested.

Archbishop Lucey of my State has written me that he felt it was very important that the Senate give consideration to the appropriation of \$100,000 for the purpose of studying and improving the migratory labor situation all over the Nation. I understand that the Bureau of the Budget recommended this appropriation, but the House and Senate committees have turned it down. Is that the item to which the Senator addresses his amendment?

Mr. COOPER. That is correct. The President recommended it in his budget message. The House committee did not include it in the bill. There was a vote taken in the House, and I believe it was defeated by a vote of 91 to 87. The Senate committee likewise did not include it in the bill which is now before the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I believe the amendment should be considered by the Senate, and I hope it will be considered. I certainly have no objection to it. This is a matter which greatly concerns some of the great humanitarian leaders of my State. I urge the Senate to adopt the amendment.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to speak to the amendment which has been offered by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Has unanimous consent been given to offer the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not been given. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], that the second amendment offered by him, on page 2, be considered at this time, and that both amendments be considered en bloc?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. This amendment has been before the Appropriations Committee for the past 2 years, the House considered it a year ago, it was also considered by the House and Senate committees this year, and both committees rejected it. This year the House con-

sidered it and rejected it. The Senate Appropriations Committee—first the subcommittee and then the full committee—gave consideration to this entire question, and finally rejected the proposed amendment.

As chairman of the subcommittee, I must convey to the Senate the information that this question was discussed and studied in committee at considerable length, and that the final decision of the committee, supported by a large percentage of the members of the full committee, was to reject the \$100,000 item.

Certainly the amendment has merit, and I should say that possibly it would be desirable to have such a study made. But many other items in the appropriation bill were more compelling. That is why the committee did not make the funds available in the bill. For that reason, I must object to it, because I feel that after the full committee has taken action, I must support vigorously the objection which the full committee registered to the item.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I should like to explain briefly why I consider this amendment to be important.

As the distinguished Senator from Texas has brought out by his inquiry, the purpose of the amendment would be to place in the appropriation bill \$100,000, to be used by the Bureau of Labor Standards in correlating the work of the various Federal agencies and also of initiating or encouraging programs within the States to deal with the problem of migratory labor within the United States.

I know that in the past years many of us have read many official Government reports on this program. Aside from that there is a great body of literature of fiction and of studies bearing upon the problem of migratory labor within the United States.

All that literature and all the reports show the same picture. It is one of low wages and irregular employment, child labor, the lack of health and welfare services, irregular and intermittent education for children, juvenile delinquency, and crime.

A great deal has been done by some of the States and by charitable and private organizations and by churches toward meeting these unfortunate and unhappy conditions. Within the Government itself, it must be admitted, there are several agencies which deal in some way with this problem.

The Department of Agriculture has a placement service. The Child Bureau in the Department of Labor has an interest in it, as has the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare through the Office of Education.

There are many other agencies that consider the problem in one way or another. The purpose of the amendment, which may not be clear to some because it is a beginning effort on the part of the Federal Government, is to take steps to correlate and to bring together the activities of various agencies within the Federal Government itself, and direct them toward this problem and the attendant consequences of the problem.

It is also designed to take action whereby there may be given to the vari-

ous States information about the problem itself, which relates to the 1 million agricultural workers who are in constant migration and movement, of the social consequences of this movement, of the steps that certain States are taking in an advanced way to meet these consequences, and to advise and encourage the various States themselves to provide assistance.

I am certain that it is a program which, if initiated, would receive a wide response from the States and from church and religious organizations, and from many social organizations throughout the country. The point I make is that this problem has been with us for a long time.

As I said, it has been the subject of much literature. There has been nothing done by the Federal Government in an organized way.

President Eisenhower recognized this need and this problem in his budget message last year. He asked, as I remember, for the sum of \$200,000 for the Department of Labor to begin this program. It was denied by the House and was denied by the Senate.

This year, in his budget message, he again called the attention of the Congress to this problem and made the statement which I now quote:

The social and economic plight of migratory farmworkers has been studied repeatedly. Up to now little positive action to better these conditions has been taken by the Federal Government. This budget includes the recommended appropriation of \$100,000 to enable the Department of Labor to provide leadership in establishing a co-operative Federal-State program in the fiscal year 1955.

I should like also to read a brief statement made by Hon. James P. Mitchell, Secretary of Labor, before the Senate committee, in the conduct of its hearings on March 8, 1954, because I believe it is a good statement of the purposes of this amendment:

This item of \$100,000 is essentially for the same kind of a program, affecting the welfare of about 1 million workers, as was proposed to Congress for 1954. With these workers moving from State to State to meet seasonal labor needs, it becomes the responsibility of the Federal Government, I believe, to provide leadership in improving the conditions under which they work. I believe that the Department of Labor should take the initiative in attempting to find and work out constructive ways to improve their working conditions. The need for consultation and assistance to the States in trying to achieve solutions to this vexing problem, I believe, is immediate. There is an opportunity to do something through this program which will pay real dividends to the economy of the country in more stable and efficient labor and in a better way of life for the migrant workers and their children. Through our farm-placement program we have been able to do a good deal in the orderly recruitment and placement of these seasonal farmworkers, but the Department has a responsibility to give leadership and help in seeking solutions to the broader problems of community attitudes, services, and working conditions. It is such a program that the Bureau of Labor Standards proposes. I believe it will make all of our Department services in this field more effective. It will give the farmer better workers and at the same time help to give this underprivileged group of American families more

nearly the American way of life for themselves and their children. I hope your committee will give favorable consideration to it.

I point out 2 or 3 reasons for the amendment which I think should address themselves to the Senate.

First. It is for the benefit of 1 million migratory workers who constantly follow the sun, follow the seasonal crops, in order to produce food which we need and which we eat.

Second. It is designed to provide better social and educational conditions for those persons and their children.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and I have had a discussion and a conference with reference to the proposed amendment, and we agree that we will take the amendment to conference, if that will be satisfactory to the sponsor of the amendment.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the distinguished Senator.

I hope the reasons which addressed themselves to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of Labor will be considered, and I know that when the amendment is taken to conference the Senate conferees will follow the vote of the Senate and make every effort to hold it in the appropriation bill.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am very glad, indeed, to support as a cosponsor the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky. I had previously submitted an identical amendment. I am very glad, indeed, that the committee has agreed to take this amendment to conference. I very much hope it will be agreed to.

I have had a great deal of experience in connection with this subject. Some of the States have established on a voluntary basis certain departmental agencies to care for this situation. There are more than a million farm-labor migrants in this country, and they are all American citizens. I do not want any misunderstanding or confusion to take place in regard to the position of these men and women as compared with that of the so-called wetbacks. These people are American citizens. Their children are today receiving less education than their fathers and grandfathers received generations ago. They are completely cut off from all community service because they are only temporary residents of a community.

In New York State we have done a great deal to take care of the situation. In most of the States of the Union, however, the communities have not been so fortunate.

I very much hope that the amendment will receive approval in conference, and I am grateful to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I am indeed happy to note that the chairman of the committee has indicated that he will take this amendment to conference. I am certainly in full support of the amendment, because it will improve the conditions of migrant workers.

It is high time that our Department of Labor has a specific appropriation and program for this purpose.

Illiteracy, ill health, child labor, poverty, community neglect, and hostility are the lot of thousands of American farm workers' families. How can democracy function under such conditions as these? They could be the very breeding grounds upon which communism might feed at home as well as abroad.

We know that technical assistance helps to fight these very conditions which insidiously undermine the growth of democracy in other lands. We appropriate funds to support it. I say we need a few drops of technical aid at home to patch up some of the holes in America's own dike of democracy.

This proposed \$100,000 for the Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Standards to develop a program for American agricultural migrant families is the few drops we need now, and need badly. We cannot afford not to spend these few thousand dollars to get rid of some of the conditions which breed despair and destruction of democracy within our own house.

For years there have been studies and surveys, and committees and commissions have been making recommendations, pointing out the sore spots in our agricultural economy. But the Government has done nothing, and the danger to our democracy grows worse. This appropriation item gives us a chance to demonstrate that the Congress really cares about the most downtrodden group of workers in the United States.

I am sure the committee will see to it that this \$100,000 appropriation is retained in the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am delighted to align myself in this instance with the junior Senator from Kentucky and the junior Senator from New York. I recognize the difficulties under which the Appropriations Committee and its subcommittees are laboring because of the multiplicity of recommendations and requests that come to them, but in this instance I should like to say that the Eisenhower administration has made a recommendation which should receive favorable consideration of the Congress with respect to caring for the million or more American citizens migrating, as they do, from one State to another, seeking gainful employment and taking part in the harvesting of our agricultural products.

We have the opportunity by approving the appropriation of \$100,000 to assist in the programs of the States of the American Union in alleviating the conditions under which American citizens who are classified as migrants and their families are living today. One hundred thousand dollars is a small enough start to take care of a million American citizens. It amounts to approximately 10 cents a head, on the basis of \$100,000, to be applied to a million individuals who are taking part in the production of agricultural commodities for the people of the United States.

So I very much hope, Mr. President, that the amendment will be adopted by the Senate, taken to conference, and

finally retained in the bill, and thus, to the limited extent provided, the Federal Government will recognize a continuing problem faced by people who are poor, who have no homes, who are required, as was suggested earlier, to follow the sun from one State to another in order to earn a livelihood for themselves and for their families. Thus, we shall lead the way in improving the tragic lot of American migratory labor.

I very much hope the Senate will adopt the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendment to the bill on page 2, and to the committee amendment on page 3, offered by the Senator from Kentucky.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Employment Security," on page 4, line 14, after the figures "\$1,100,000," to strike out "shall" and insert "may."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "6-24-54-E," which is as follows: On page 4, line 13, delete "\$4,650,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$5,050,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona is not an amendment to a committee amendment. The committee amendments are still pending.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have no objection to the adoption of the committee amendments, but I should like to have my amendment disposed of now. I do not understand that there has been an agreement to consider committee amendments first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendments to the bill may not be considered until after the committee amendments have been acted upon.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I may say that the Senator from Arizona has a very heavy schedule of attendance on conference committees. Therefore, in order to accommodate him, I should be perfectly willing, by unanimous consent, to agree to have his amendment considered now, rather than to have him wait until all committee amendments are disposed of. The item to which the Senator from Arizona refers is not a committee amendment. The \$4,650,000 in the Senate bill is the same figure as was passed by the House.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. As I understand, the Senator from Arizona desires to offer an amendment which would increase the

amount by \$400,000, so as to make the appropriation \$5,050,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none.

The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 13, it is proposed to delete "\$4,650,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$5,050,000."

Mr. HAYDEN. The Bureau of the Budget now admits that a mistake was made in reducing the appropriation for the Veterans' Employment Service by \$400,000, which would require it to reduce its personnel to the lowest point since before World War II.

The Veterans' Employment Service workload is increasing. There are now more than 20 million veterans. The number of veterans is increasing at the rate of from 75,000 to 100,000 a month.

Many veterans, particularly the Korean veterans, are experiencing difficulty in securing employment in the current labor market, or in otherwise making satisfactory adjustment to civilian life, and are requiring more specialized assistance from the Veterans' Employment Service.

The House reduced the amount requested in the budget by \$110,000 and then directed that the \$400,000 for the Veterans' Employment Service be taken from other activities of the Department of Labor. I have a statement from the Bureau of the Budget which shows what the effect of such action would be. To do so would eliminate the interstate farm information program which directs domestic migrant farm workers according to crop conditions.

It would eliminate labor market analysis, which shows current and near future employment by industry, and would restrict area labor market analysis solely to large areas. No analysis will be possible for smaller areas.

It would prevent a planned intensive drive against fraudulent claims payments and a proposed study of the adequacy of unemployment compensation benefits.

It would curtail Federal guidance on placement activities by the States and Federal clearinghouse operations.

It would create a backlog in audit of State operations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement which I have obtained from the Bureau of the Budget be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The following tabulation compares the 1954 and 1955 budgets for the Bureau of Employment Security, salaries and expenses:

	Adjusted 1954	1955		1955 change House over budget
		Budget	House	
Veterans' Employment Service.....	\$1,073,400	\$700,000	\$1,100,000	+\$400,000
Remaining programs.....	4,200,000	4,060,000	3,550,000	-510,000
Total salaries and expenses.....	5,273,400	4,760,000	4,650,000	-110,000

While the total House cut is but \$110,000 the distribution reduces the non-Veterans Employment Service operations by \$510,000. The House action provides \$400,000 additional to the VES program at the expense of high-priority activities. The House figure:

1. Eliminates the interstate farm information program which directs domestic migrant farm workers according to crop conditions.

2. Eliminates labor-market analysis which shows current and near future employment by industry; restricts area labor market analysis solely to large areas. No analysis will be possible for smaller areas; wipes out Federal assistance to local community employment programs. These activities are especially pertinent, currently for programs seeking to decrease local unemployment.

3. Prevents a planned intensive drive against fraudulent claims payment and a proposed study on adequacy of unemployment compensation benefits.

4. Curtails Federal guidance on placement activities by the States and Federal clearinghouse operations under which one State's decisions and procedures are made available to all other States.

5. Creates a backlog in audit of State operations and requires heavy overtime in analysis and review of State budget requests.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Arizona has made a statement that the Bureau of the Budget has made a mistake. Certainly that was not the evidence before our committee, as the Senator will remember. Does the Senator have a letter from the Bureau, or upon what authority does he make the statement. I should like to know if the Senator has an unsigned memorandum or a signed letter. Also, I desire to know if the Bureau of the Budget stands behind the statement of the Senator that the Bureau has made a mistake.

Mr. HAYDEN. I made inquiry as to what the effect of the change would be, and this is its statement.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am not questioning the Senator's word, as he well knows. Certainly, anything he says in serious vein, I believe. But I wish to know something about the situation.

Has the Senator from Arizona any communication from the Bureau of the Budget, in writing, which could be used in the committee of conference or anywhere else, which states that the Bureau has made a mistake?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have placed this statement in the RECORD. If the Senator from New Hampshire inquires of the Bureau of the Budget in regard to it, he will find that the Bureau will stand behind the statement.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from Arizona has stated that the Bureau of the Budget is willing to agree that it made a mistake in its budget recommendation. The subcommittee which conducted hearings on the question had no such information.

In the bill as it came from the House it was specifically stated that \$1,100,000 was for a Veterans' Administration fund, and contained the word "shall." The Senate committee struck out the word

"shall" and inserted in lieu thereof the word "may."

Mr. HAYDEN. That change from "shall" to "may" helps some, but it does not take care of the entire situation.

Mr. THYE. Yes. But the subcommittee which held hearings did not receive information that the Bureau of the Budget had made an error. This is the language of the request made to the committee:

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the general administration of the employment service and unemployment compensation programs, including temporary employment of persons, without regard to the civil-service laws, for the farm placement migratory-labor program; and not to exceed \$10,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a).

Following that is a recommendation that the amount should be changed from \$4,650,000 to \$4,760,000.

That information was received by us simply as a departmental recommendation; we received no evidence that the Bureau of the Budget had conceded they had made a mistake.

Mr. HAYDEN. I understand; but when the Bureau of the Budget learned of the action taken by the House, and became aware of what the effect of that action would be, they made a statement which I have placed in the RECORD, and which can be verified by contacting the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget dated June 21, 1954, which is a very recent letter. I should like to have the attention of Senators while I read it, because it is not in accordance with the statement which the Senator from Arizona has made. It reads as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE

OF THE PRESIDENT,

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,

Washington, D. C., June 21, 1954.

Hon. STYLES BRIDGES,

Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BRIDGES: In the course of marking up the 1955 appropriation bill for the Department of Labor, you may wish to give consideration to the effects of the House action on the salaries and expenses of the Bureau of Employment Security. A brief statement is enclosed which summarizes these effects.

The Secretary of Labor feels that if the House action stands, as compared with the President's budget, the work of the Bureau will be crippled very seriously in a number of basic activities. As you know, the major costs in the Department's budget are those associated with the employment service and unemployment compensation programs, and it would seem very important to continue the basic work which affects the soundness of these large operations. The recommendations shown in the President's budget reflected our best judgment on the priorities.

Sincerely yours,

ROWLAND HUGHES,

Director.

In other words, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget still stands on his statement made before the committee with respect to the original budget.

That is what has bothered me, in connection with what the Senator from Arizona seeks to do.

Mr. HAYDEN. That may be, but the Bureau of the Budget confesses, in the letter which the Senator from New Hampshire has read and in the statement which I have presented, that the reduction would have very adverse effects on a number of activities of the Department of Labor.

Mr. BRIDGES. In the letter to me the Bureau does not make such a confession; it says it stands on the original budget.

Mr. HAYDEN. What can be done is to take my amendment to conference; then the conferees can take up the question with the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. BRIDGES. If that is done, it will give us an opportunity to ascertain exactly where the Bureau of the Budget stands. But certainly the committee acted in good faith.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am not charging anyone with bad faith.

Mr. BRIDGES. I understand that. The Senator from Arizona and I may differ on questions, but we never will challenge anyone's good faith. In this instance, the Senator has information different from that which the committee received.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have already placed the memorandum from the Bureau of the Budget in the RECORD.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. If I understand correctly, the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona would increase the amount for the Bureau of Employment Security \$400,000?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. I am somewhat familiar, of course, with the problems of the Appropriations Committee, and I sympathize with it, and therefore I do not like to come on the floor of the Senate and urge increases. However, I have made an investigation of the Bureau of Employment Security and I believe the effect on it of the reduced appropriation would be most unfortunate. I sincerely hope the committee will take the amendment to conference and consider it. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. THYE. The Budget Bureau recommended \$110,000 more than the House committee or the Senate committee were willing to approve. I should like to have the attention of the distinguished Senator from Arizona. I will be very frank and state that as chairman of the subcommittee I put a question mark on the item as I carried it from the subcommittee to the full committee. I personally feel we were conservative in appropriating for the item. I make that statement in all frankness. However, I do not believe that we should go to the extent of adopting the full increase proposed by the Senator from Arizona, because the Senator is proposing to increase the item by \$400,000, and the Budget Bureau recommended an increase of only \$110,000 above what both the House and Senate committees agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am sure that the Senator from Minnesota will agree with me that we do not wish to have anything happen to the other divisions of the Labor Department which will seriously cripple their ability to perform the duties imposed upon them by law. I suggest that the amendment increasing the item \$400,000 be agreed to, which will restore the \$110,000 cut made by the committees of both Houses. It will provide \$75,000 with which to pay terminal leave costs due to reduction in personnel. As opposed to the cut by the Bureau of the Budget of \$1,100,000 for the Employment Service, it would give the Secretary of Labor maximum flexibility.

If the amount is taken to conference and a compromise is reached on a figure anywhere between \$110,000 and \$400,000, the Senator from Arizona will be satisfied.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from Arizona means, as I understand, that he desires that we go above the Budget Bureau recommendation, and take the full \$400,000 increase to conference?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. THYE. Of course, the Senator from Arizona will be one of the conferees.

Mr. HAYDEN. No, I will not, I am not a member of the subcommittee which considered this bill.

Mr. THYE. The Senator is correct. The Senator from Arizona is on so many conferences that I thought he would be on this one.

Mr. HAYDEN. No; I shall not be. The pending item was brought to my attention, and it certainly is worthy of the attention of the conferees, in view of the reductions in clerical force which would take place which would affect persons who had been employed there for more than 10 years. If the reduction in appropriation is adhered to, \$75,000 will have to be paid in terminal leave benefits. I am sure the Senate does not want that to happen. When the increased amount is taken to conference, I am sure that contact can be made with representatives of the Department of Labor and the Bureau of the Budget to the end that no undue hardship will be incurred for lack of necessary funds.

Mr. THYE. I must call to the Senator's attention the fact that the \$400,000 increase which the Senator proposes is \$290,000 above the Budget Bureau's recommendation in the first instance. That would make it exceedingly difficult for me, as subcommittee chairman, to take such a sum to conference.

I should be perfectly satisfied and agreeable if the Senator from Arizona would modify his amendment so that the increase would be in the amount recommended by the Budget Bureau, \$110,000, because, as I have frankly stated, I had a question mark on this item when I carried it from the subcommittee to the full committee. I felt that the subcommittee had been too conservative. However, for me to state that I would be willing to take to conference an item which is \$290,000 above the recommendation of the Budget Bureau would be inconsistent with a subcommittee chairman's responsibility to the full committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator from Minnesota feels that way about it, I modify my amendment by proposing to increase the amount \$110,000, instead of \$400,000.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I shall be very happy to take the item to conference with that increase, because we would not be exceeding the Budget Bureau's recommendation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arizona, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 7, after the word "which", to strike out "\$16,400,000" and insert "\$6,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 11, after the word "paid", to insert "or salary costs resulting from changes in compensation plans."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, the subcommittee chairman, will recall that we had a discussion as to what the meaning of this language was.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I do not like to interfere, but I should like to state that this is an amendment in which the Senator from New Hampshire suggested 2 or 3 words. Then a member of the committee very quickly moved to add to the language suggested. The Senator from New Hampshire did not exactly know at that time what the legal interpretation of the additional words would be. The Senator from New Hampshire now thinks that the original language would be better than that of the committee amendment.

Mr. HILL. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire that the Senator from Alabama rose to make that very statement. He thinks that the original language of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire is the proper language. The words "or salary costs" are what we seek to have in the bill.

Mr. President, I move to amend the committee amendment on page 5, line 11, by striking out after the word "costs" the words "resulting from changes in compensation plans."

As I think the Senator from New Hampshire implied, if the Senate agrees to the amendment there will be adopted what was in the mind of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire and what was the intention of the committee at the time the committee reported the bill.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the amendment to the amendment is perfectly agreeable to me, because the author of the amendment concedes that there was some doubt as to the legal interpretation of the additional words.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment to the committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 5, in lines 11 and 12, it is proposed to strike out the words "resulting from changes in compensation plans."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 3, to strike out "\$1,521,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,581,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 17, to strike out "\$6,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$6,100,000."

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment to the committee amendment, which is designated 6-24-54-H.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment to the committee amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 10, line 17, it is proposed to strike out "\$6,100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$6,233,000."

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I should like to speak briefly on behalf of my amendment to restore the fiscal 1955 appropriations for the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor, to \$6,233,000, the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

It was with genuine concern that I saw Congress last year approve a sizable reduction in operating funds for this Division charged with proper enforcement of the laws that insure minimum labor standards and wages to the American workingman and woman. It is with even greater concern that I again see this year the moneys recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for this Division being reduced by congressional action.

The Wage and Hour Division has jurisdiction and primary responsibility for the enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Act, which insures to the American worker a minimum wage, the Davis-Bacon Construction Act and the Walsh-Healey Public Contract Act which insure to the American worker engaged on Government contracts comparable standards and wages to those prevailing in similar private industries and construction companies.

The appropriations for this Division since 1951, the year of its highest appropriation, are as follows:

For 1951, \$9,396,400.

For 1952, \$8,510,000.

For 1953, \$7,639,139.

For 1954, \$6,250,000.

For 1955, \$6,000,000 passed by the House, \$6,100,000 reported out by the Senate Appropriations Committee, contrasted with \$6,233,000 approved by the Budget Bureau and identical with the amount of my amendment.

Last year the reduction of over \$1 million in the appropriation resulted in the closing of 22 field offices of this Division and the dismissal of over 300 employees.

If the proposed reduction occurs, the current employment of this Division—of 1,043 people—will be reduced to an alltime low of 1,009 people. This compares with the maximum employment of 1951 of over 1,800 people.

The brunt of this year's reduction in force will be borne by the Investigation Division, which has been making the inspections for possible law violations. According to figures of the Department of Labor, the number of Wage and Hour Investigators—who also do Walsh-Healey inspection—is down to 493 during the current fiscal year, as compared to 852 in 1951, 740 in 1952, and 612 in 1953. The 493 figure is even lower than the number in 1942, when there were 529 inspectors. Two years ago, some 40,000 inspections were made. Last year despite reductions, about the same total was reached, except that—very significantly—the inspections had to be of the short-cut type, meaning limited employee interviews and a cursory inspection of the plant. From the division's viewpoint, this is a very unsatisfactory way of finding out whether the law is being obeyed. It should be emphasized here that roughly about one-half of these inspections show violations of the minimum-wage requirements.

STATISTICS

In 1941, about 48,500 firms were inspected, and more than 31,000 were found in violation, with more than 18,000 requiring restitution of wages. This pattern has held up fairly consistently throughout the years, with more than 50 percent of the inspected firms being found in violation—in some years in major violation—of the act.

In 1949, before the 75-cent-minimum rate became effective, there were more than 32,000 inspections, and more than 18,000 firms were found in violation. In 1951, there were more than 26,000 inspections, with almost 19,000 firms being found in violation of the act—more than 6,000 in violation of the minimum wage. The same generally was true in 1952 and 1953, with 24,000 out of 41,000 and 20,000 out of 38,000 found in violation. In these 2 years the minimum-wage violations were over 7,000 and over 4,000, respectively. The same trend continues into 1954.

In 1941, Congress expressed the opinion, that at least 14 or 15 percent of covered firms should be inspected. This percentage has never been reached. Twelve percent was reached in 1 year, but this amount gradually sank to around 4 percent in 1950, and now is scarcely more than 5 percent. Only 5 percent of the covered firms are inspected within any 1 year.

And now, with enforcement personnel being reduced, the number of firms and employees to be inspected has increased appreciably, adding to the difficulties of proper enforcement. In 1940, 250,000 firms, with 12,652,700 employees, were covered by the Wage and Hour Act. Today, more than 715,000 firms, with around 21 million employees are covered by the act.

Also of particular concern this year will be the serious effect of these reductions upon the enforcement of these laws in Puerto Rico, where the Territorial government as well as industry on that island have been requesting action regarding substandard wage conditions. If this reduction is carried out, the present system of using two industrial com-

mittees on the island—of 9 members each: 3 from labor, 3 from management, and 3 from the general public—will be reduced to 1 industrial committee. This will mean, contrary to the express provisions of section 8 of the Fair Labor Standards Act, that the minimum wage rates for a particular industry in Puerto Rico could be reviewed on an average of only once every 7 years. This time lag in reviewing will exist at a time when many Puerto Rican workers are receiving minimum wages of 30 cents and even 18 cents an hour, in industries competing with industries on the mainland.

The maximum effect of this proposed reduction will, therefore, be felt in enforcing one of our basic labor laws—the minimum-wage law. The effect would also be felt in enforcing the Davis-Bacon and Walsh-Healey Acts.

In 1950, Reorganization Plan No. 14 clearly contemplated enforcement of the Davis-Bacon Public Contracts Act by a Labor Department staff especially trained for that purpose, instead of the unsatisfactory practice of relying upon contracting officers and investigating only 2 or 3 of the more aggravated violations a year. Despite the plan and despite repeated requests for modest appropriations to train a specialized inspecting staff, nothing more has been done to execute the intent of this reorganization plan, because funds have not been made available.

The change from a total of over \$9¼ million, 5 years ago, and over 1,800 employees to less than two-thirds of this amount and one-half the number of employees, shows the gradual, almost systematic destruction of the effectiveness of this Division of the Department of Labor in protecting the standards and safeguarding the minimum wages of the American working man and woman.

My amendment would put into law the judgment and recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget as to what funds are necessary to operate this department in the coming year. At the same time, my amendment would make more certain that the capable, hard-working staff of the Wage and Hour Division can do the work Congress intended it should do, namely, the proper enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Davis-Bacon Act, and the Walsh-Healey Act.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I sincerely hope that those of my colleagues who believe in the continuation of an effective Wage and Hour Division will support my amendment to increase this appropriation to the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. President, if we are to continue on the statute books the laws passed by Congress, then we, in turn, must give the departments and agencies we charge with the responsibility of carrying out those laws, adequate tools with which to work.

It is foolish to cripple an agency, by stripping it of the means of carrying out a law. Better it is to eliminate the law from the statute books. So, Mr. President, I hope very much that my amendment to the committee amendment will be adopted.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from

Maine that the testimony the subcommittee received at the hearings supports the contention of the Senator from Maine that the amount appropriated by the bill is too small. I am aware of the fact that, as chairman of the subcommittee, I have the responsibility of supporting the action taken by the full committee, as well as the action taken by the subcommittee. Nevertheless, judging from the testimony we received in the hearings, I felt that the House of Representatives had been too conservative in this respect, and I recommended to the subcommittee and also to the full committee that the full amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, namely, \$6,233,000, be allowed.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am willing to take to conference the amendment of the Senator from Maine, for the reason that, judging from the testimony given at the hearings, we recognize that the amount voted by the House of Representatives was a very conservative one and might result in handicapping the Department in connection with its making of the necessary inspections to enforce the acts Congress previously has placed on the statute books, and has charged the Department with the responsibility of enforcing. From the testimony we received at the hearings, I recognize that situation. Therefore, I am willing to accept the amendment and take it to conference, even though I am not unmindful of the fact that, as chairman of the subcommittee, I have the responsibility of upholding the judgment of the full committee.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I should like to express my thanks and appreciation to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I wish to express my thanks to the chairman of the subcommittee, who is in charge of the pending bill, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], who not only has indicated a desire to be cooperative, but also has indicated that he wishes to see this sum restored.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine to the committee amendment on page 10, line 17.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

LOBBYING WITH APPROPRIATED MONEYS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, title XVIII of the United States Code, on the subject of Crimes and Criminal Procedure, reads as follows:

UNITED STATES CODE, TITLE 18, CRIMES AND CRIMINAL PROCEDURE

SEC. 1913. Lobbying with appropriated moneys: No part of the money appropriated by any enactment of Congress shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any

legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation; but this shall not prevent officers or employees of the United States or of its departments or agencies from communicating to Members of Congress, through the proper official channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business.

Whoever, being an officer or employee of the United States or of any department or agency thereof, violates or attempts to violate this section, shall be fined not more than \$500 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both; and after notice and hearing by the superior officer vested with the power of removing him, shall be removed from office or employment (June 25, 1948, ch. 645, sec. 1, 62 Stat. 792, effective Sept. 1, 1948).

Mr. President, last week I offered an amendment to one of the appropriation bills. The purpose of the amendment was to limit the use of Government funds for the expansion of the commercial-broiler industry. The amendment was adopted by the Senate, without opposition. I was very much surprised to find that, under date of June 22, 1954, 5 telegrams, costing an average of over \$25 apiece, were sent by a Government agency to the conferees and also to the chairmen of the respective committees, all at Government expense. The telegrams are too lengthy to be printed in the RECORD, but they express opposition to the amendment. The telegrams were sent by Mr. J. B. E. LaPlante, general agent, Farm Credit Administration, of Louisville, Ky. Mr. President, that represented \$125 worth of telegrams—5 telegrams—any one of which could have been sent by airmail and would have arrived practically as soon.

At any rate, the telegrams were sent for the direct purpose—as can be noted from their contents—of influencing the action of the conferees on this particular amendment.

I am referring this matter to both the Civil Service Commission and the Department of Justice, because I think we might just as well establish whether the Government agencies can use Government funds to send \$25 telegrams for the purpose of influencing the decisions of Congress. I have checked with Mr. Young, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, and have been advised that the employees of the Federal Credit Bank, the employees of the Federal intermediate banks, the employees of the Production Credit Bank, the Bank for Cooperatives, and Federal land banks, are all under schedule A, and as such are accepted as civil-service employees. About 10 or 12 positions in the Farm Credit Administration are under schedule C. These are primarily jobs in Washington. All regional directors are under schedule C. They are still eligible for civil-service retirement and practically all are under retirement. So there is no question that these were employees of the Government and were recognized as such.

I fully recognize the responsibility of these agents and men in the field to express their opinions, whether they are for or against any legislation which happens to be pending, and I will defend

that right. At the same time, I think it is a little out of line when they send \$25 telegrams and charge them to the American taxpayers.

The conferees dropped this amendment, not because of this telegram, since it did not arrive until about 6 hours after the conference committee had agreed. I am not here to criticize the conference committee or its action, even though I disagree with its decision. However, I wish to point out one misrepresentation in connection with this amendment; and that is, that it involves such great danger and would cause such great hardship to the many little farmers scattered throughout the country.

The substance of this telegram is that there is a vast majority of little farmers who would be affected by the amendment and that they should be safeguarded. It is said that the private farm must be protected. I agree with that but what is overlooked entirely is the fact that the amendment excluded 85 percent of all the loans made by any of the agencies affected.

It is said that some of the small farmers would have been put out of business if the amendment had been adopted. I wish to outline briefly a description of some of the poor little fellows who are up against it so desperately and who are using some of this Government money.

One of these little fellows who obtained a loan from the Farm Credit Administration is Mr. Otto Zurcher, of Arapahoe, Colo. Mr. Zurcher borrowed \$58,100 from the Farm Credit Administration. In listing his sources of income other than his farming operations he indicated that for the next 6 months perhaps he might make \$2,600.

The Department in approving the loan states very clearly that the loan was granted to help this individual pay off his creditors, who were pressing him for immediate payment of their bills. This particular man evidently was up against the wall and would not be able to continue his operations without this particular loan.

What was not explained at the time was that the loan was largely used to pay off a loan which the same man had with another Government agency. He was borrowing money from one Government agency to pay another.

Also it was not brought out at the time that this so-called little farmer was operating quite a construction business through the Federal Housing Administration guaranty on loans under title I. He was building several houses and had received Government guaranties on more than \$1 million in mortgages.

Speaking further of this same little fellow, after he obtained this loan to assist him in order that he might continue as a little farmer, he built a restaurant. He is also operating a rather elaborate tourist camp supposedly all with Government funds.

So I think we might as well get it straight as to who is interested in whom and that it is not the little farmers who are protesting the adoption of this amendment.

On reading an application for another of these loans that happened to be

granted in the same agency which is protesting so strenuously this particular amendment, I find that another gentleman applied for a loan of \$16,675. He, too, is very hard up. He is up against the wall, and he required this loan in order to continue his necessary farming operations. I notice that in his application he lists his average yearly professional income at \$12,000 a year. He happens to be a doctor. He lists his income at \$12,000 a year, but I suppose the Department of Agriculture thought it necessary in this age of surpluses to finance this doctor, who lists his income at \$12,000 a year, in order that he may operate a farm in competition with bona fide farmers who are actually dependent upon farm income.

I suppose they thought there was some justification in this particular case because in reviewing this doctor's financial statement we find that the doctor was down to his last Cadillac. He listed only 1 jeep and 1 Cadillac. I suppose that is another little fellow the officials in the Department had in mind when they opposed my amendment.

They keep emphasizing that the average amount of loan is very small. They claim that 85 percent of all the loans made go to the little fellows. That is true; but if we examine the statistics we find that this 85 percent representing so-called small borrowers is getting only about 5 or 10 percent of the money which is being loaned. Furthermore, this 85 percent would not be affected by my amendment.

In examining the loans made by the same agency which is protesting against the amendment, I ran across another interesting case. Three loans for commercial broiler expansion were made in the State of Ohio. It was said that the average of the three loans was \$11,721. However, one can prove almost anything with figures. It is rather interesting to examine the breakdown in that particular case. We find that there were only three loans involved. One man obtained a loan for \$1,550, another for \$2,230, neither of which would have been affected by the amendment I offered. However, the third loan was for \$31,384—making the average loan \$11,721.

An interesting fact about the \$31,384 loan was that again it was not an individual who was operating his own farm who received the loan. This man was not connected with the medical profession nor was he a builder. At the time he obtained his loan, he was working in the Department of Agriculture in the city of Washington. He borrowed the money to build a \$36,000 broiler house on his farm in the State of Ohio. The loan was for the construction of broiler houses which it is estimated would provide a capacity for producing about 100,000 broilers every 3 or 4 months.

At the same time the Agriculture Department approved this loan, the Department of Agriculture was sending out instructions to other broiler-producing areas urging farmers to cut back their production on the basis there was a great oversupply.

The official to whom I have reference is J. Frank Kendrick. In 1951, at the

time he obtained this loan, Mr. Kendrick was working for the Department of Agriculture here in the city of Washington, in the Dairy Herd Improvement Investigations Division of the Bureau of Dairy Industry, Agricultural Research Administration. He was drawing \$8,400 a year. Mr. Kendrick was later promoted, and today he is serving as the head of the Regional Experiment Stations, Dairy Herd Improvement Investigations Division of the Bureau of Dairy Industry, Agricultural Research Administration, in Washington, D. C., and is drawing \$9,360 a year. It is he who urged the recommendation of his own loan by another lending division in the same Department, whereby he received this loan of \$31,384 for the construction of commercial broiler-producing houses in order that he could compete, with the help of Government money, against the same farmers for whom he has expressed such great sympathy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a letter from Mr. R. B. McLeaish, Administrator of the Farmers' Home Administration, in which he confirms this particular case.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 22, 1954.
Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in preliminary reply to your letter of June 14 requesting a report of any instances which have come to my attention wherein Government funds for the expansion of the poultry industry have been loaned either direct to Federal employees or to companies in which they were affiliated.

We are undertaking a field survey to secure the answer to your question and, incidentally, are taking the opportunity to find out how many loans might have been made to Federal employees for any purpose. The only loan made to a Federal employee that has come to my personal attention, I discovered as a result of your earlier inquiry concerning loans to anyone to engage in the business of commercial broiler production. This particular loan is one which should never have been made, and I am grateful to you for raising questions which brought it to my attention. The loan was made on March 14, 1951, to an individual employed by the Department of Agriculture in Washington in the amount of \$27,000 under title V of the Housing Act of 1949. The loan was made by our county office at Troy, Ohio, on a farm the individual owns in Champaign County, Ohio. With the proceeds of the loan, plus additional funds and materials which he contributed, a commercial broiler house costing \$31,384 and a house costing \$6,258 were constructed.

My investigation of the case indicates that the applicant had assets of about \$62,000 with no debts, and should not have been given the loan under the existing instructions of the agency, though it appears to have been legally permissible. The loan file discloses a letter written from the Washington office to the State director in Ohio criticizing the making of the loan, and asking that the State director call upon the borrower to refinance the loan as soon as possible. The authority to require the borrower to refinance when he is able to do so is part of the note. Since this matter has come to my attention, I have personally talked

to the borrower and have called upon him to refinance his loan which he has agreed to do, if possible, within a 30-day period. Among other things, I pointed out that the making of this loan resulted in denying loans to 5 or 6 applicants who were deserving of assistance. The payments on the loan are current. Of course, it is a long-term 20-year loan and \$24,589 is still outstanding.

We expect to have our field survey completed within a few weeks and we will make a complete reply to your letter at that time.

Sincerely yours,

R. B. MCLEAISH,
Administrator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish to emphasize at this point that I am not criticizing Mr. McLeaish for his administration of his agency. These loans took place prior to his appointment. In fact, it is only through the cooperation of men like Mr. McLeaish that we have been able to uncover the fact that large sums of money are being used to finance excessive loans for the construction of commercial broiler houses.

Mr. President, it seems rather strange to find an agency of the Government using Government funds for the purpose of protesting the adoption of an amendment which unquestionably has the endorsement of 90 percent of the farmers in our area and I venture to say in every other area of the country so far as legitimate farming operations are concerned.

Again I pay my respects to Mr. McLeaish for the prompt action which he took in stopping this unsound practice in his agency. I hope other administrators will reexamine their own policy and likewise take action to protect the real farmers of this country.

I am referring this case both to the Civil Service Commission and to the Department of Justice, and I believe it should receive their very careful study.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WEL- FARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1955

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9447) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] may offer an amendment to the bill at this time, out of order, because he must meet a commitment elsewhere.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from West Virginia may offer his amendment.

Mr. NEELY. I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 12, line 18, it is proposed to strike out the figure "\$5,100,000" and to insert in lieu thereof the figure "\$5,200,000."

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to restore the

\$100,000 which the House slashed from the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. It is necessary to enable the efficient and indispensable Food and Drug Administration to discharge its duty in a proper manner.

It is my hope that the amendment will be unanimously adopted.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I wish to support the proposed amendment and say that testimony given before the subcommittee would completely justify the Food and Drug Administration having appropriated to it the sum of \$5,200,000. The additional \$100,000, of course, would be for the Food and Drug Inspection Service.

The question is one which the Committee on Appropriations had considered at some length, but finally the committee had to agree to the sum of \$5,100,000. I am willing to take the amendment to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] on page 12, line 18.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General Provisions," on page 10, after line 24, to insert:

SEC. 103. Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation in this title available for salaries and expenses may be transferred to any other such appropriation, but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 5 percent by any such transfer: *Provided*, That no such transfer shall be used for creation of new functions within the Department, nor shall the total amount transferred in fiscal year 1955 exceed \$100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—American Printing House for the Blind," on page 11, line 14, after "(20 U. S. C. 101)", to strike out "\$175,000" and insert "\$205,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Education," on page 16, line 22, after the word "amended", to strike out "\$55,000,000" and insert "\$58,500,000"; and in line 24, after the word "act", to insert a colon and "Provided further, That the 3 percent deduction provided for in section 3 (c) (1) of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, as amended, shall not take effect for any fiscal year beginning prior to July 1, 1955."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Vocational Rehabilitation," on page 19, line 10, to strike out "\$620,000" and insert "\$650,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Health Service," on page 19, line 17, after the word "Corps", to insert "and expenses for primary and secondary schooling for dependents of personnel of the service stationed outside the continental limits of the United States in amounts not exceeding \$225 per student when the Surgeon General finds that schools available in the locality are unable to provide adequately for the education of such dependents."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, at the time the committee gave consideration to this item there was a bill before the Subcommittee on Armed Services of the Committee on Appropriations, and the committee agreed that we would modify and amend the appropriation bill so as to be consistent with the bill which would be reported from that subcommittee.

So I offer an amendment to the committee amendment to increase the sum of \$225 per student to the sum of \$235.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota to the committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 19, line 20, it is proposed to strike "\$225" and insert "\$235."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 22, after the figures "\$6,000,000", to insert "of which not less than \$4,500,000 shall be available only for grants to States, to be matched by an equal amount of State funds expended for the same purpose, for direct expenses of case-finding projects, including salaries, fees, and travel of personnel directly engaged in case finding and the necessary equipment and supplies used directly in case-finding operations, but excluding the purchase of care in hospitals and sanatoria."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that I am sure the committee had no intention or design to do anything which might be harmful to the tuberculosis programs in the various States. I know the committee wanted to help to encourage those programs. We try to see to it that the States and local communities do their fair part. I think the committee amendment as now written might result in a great harm.

To the committee amendment I should like to offer an amendment to insert on page 20, line 24, after the word "State", the words "and local," so that the matching would be not only of State funds, but of State and local funds.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have no objections to the addition of the words "and local." The question has been studied and discussed, and the amendment is perfectly agreeable.

Mr. HILL. On page 21, line 3, I should like to insert after the word "in" the words "prevention and", so that the language would read "directly in prevention and case-finding operations."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have no objection to that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments offered by the Senator from Alabama to the committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment it is proposed to insert in line 24, on page 20, after the word "State", the words "and local", and on page 21, line 3, to insert after the word "in", the words "prevention and."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments to the committee amendment.

The amendments to the amendment were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is now on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, there are a number of amendments to which I think there will be no objection. I wonder if the Senator from Minnesota does not want to follow what has become more or less the usual practice, to have all the committee amendments agreed to with the understanding that reconsideration can be had.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the only reason I have not suggested that is because I wanted Senators who had some commitments to have an opportunity to offer their amendments out of order.

Mr. HILL. I was suggesting that we follow the procedure which is often followed where there are a number of minor amendments to which there is no objection, and agree to the amendments en bloc with the understanding that any Senator can offer an amendment to any of the committee amendments.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the only reason why I did not make such a request is because there are certain amendments in the bill which should be called to the attention of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 11, after the figures "\$1,125,000", to strike out the comma and "of which not less than \$160,000 shall be available only for the activation and operation of the two immobilized marine health units "Health" and "Hygiene."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 23, after the word "amended", to strike out "\$750,000" and insert "\$950,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 2, after the word "act", to strike out "\$21,237,000" and insert "\$22,737,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 6, to strike out "\$13,460,000" and insert "\$14,460,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 9, to strike out "\$16,168,000" and insert "\$17,168,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 13, after the word "conditions", to strike out "\$1,740,000" and insert "\$1,990,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 16, after the word "diseases", to strike out "\$7,270,000" and insert "\$9,270,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 21, to strike out "\$5,930,000" and insert "\$6,430,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 24, after the word "blindness", to strike out "\$6,913,000" and insert "\$8,413,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "St. Elizabeths Hospital," on page 27, line 14, after the word "Administration", to insert a colon and "Provided further, That the services financed by this appropriation shall be included in the term "care" as used in section 2 of the act of August 4, 1947 (24 U. S. C. 168a)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, after line 17, to insert:

Construction, maximum security building: For the preparation of tentative drawings for a maximum security building at Saint Elizabeths Hospital, \$110,000: *Provided*, That with respect to construction of new facilities hereafter authorized the per diem rate calculated for the District of Columbia pursuant to section 2 of the act of August 4, 1947 (24 U. S. C. 168a), shall include a proportionate share of the annual increment of the depreciated total cost of such construction, such depreciation to be based on the estimated life, not exceeding 40 years, of such construction, to be determined by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, beginning with the fiscal year following completion of construction, and such proportionate share shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Social Security Administration," on page 28, line 13, after the word "than", to strike out "\$64,150,000" and insert "\$64,650,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 23, after the word "year", to insert a colon and "Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for payments to a State under titles I, IV, and X for administration of the State plan in excess of 7 percent of the Federal share of assistance payments under each such plan."

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, we are still considering committee amendments and are endeavoring to get through with all the committee amendments.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I desire to know whether upon adoption of the amendment now pending, Senators will have the right subsequently to offer amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise the Senator that once an amendment is agreed to it cannot be amended without reconsideration.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] be permitted to offer an amendment to the amendment now pending, rather than to pass the amendment over at this time.

I want to keep them in order, because some Senators who have amendments to offer have left the floor. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Connecticut may be permitted to offer his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I first wish to compliment the committee on the fine work it has done in its report and in connection with the proposed amendments. However, to the proviso on page 28, line 24, I must object and ask that it not be agreed to, for the reason that if it is adopted and enforced it will adversely affect approximately from 25 to 27 States and will benefit no State. If 7 percent is the maximum percentage provided for under the proposed amendment it will mean that many States will have much less money on which to operate than they presently have. In the case of California, it will deny that State \$2,633,000.

In the State of Massachusetts it will reduce the sum available by \$1,740,000.

In the case of New York, by \$6,963,000.

In Pennsylvania, by \$1,360,000.

In my own State it will reduce the amount from \$854,000 to \$617,000.

I should like to point out that under the language of the proviso not more than 7 percent may be used for administration costs. Let me point out that many times the administrative costs determine the caseloads. There may be high administrative costs, but low caseloads.

In the case of Connecticut I think the number receiving old-age assistance is 84 persons out of 1,000. Some States, with low administrative costs have several times that many persons per thousand presently enjoying old-age assistance.

So in an area which has high administrative costs it may be that the area needs specific study, and I think time should be allowed for such a study.

I think any action at this time will cause disruption in many States which are presently engaged in making plans for old-age assistance and also, I may say, for aid to dependent children and aid to the blind.

So I hope this particular provision of the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. PURTELL. I am happy to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. I congratulate my distinguished colleague upon his remarks on the amendment. I join with him in urging the Senate to reject the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PURTELL. I have yielded to the senior Senator from Connecticut. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from South Carolina when the Senator from Connecticut has finished.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter addressed to me by the commissioner of welfare of the State of Connecticut relating to this subject.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 24, 1954.

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Senate Report No. 1623 accompanying House of Representatives bill No. 9447 contains a provision concerning administrative costs which would be most unfair to the State of Connecticut. The proposal is that the percentage of administrative costs in relation to the Federal share of assistance payments among the several States shall be no higher than 7 percent.

In actual dollars Connecticut would lose \$236,567 per year under this arbitrary limitation. Connecticut would of necessity have to raise this money from Connecticut taxes or reduce staff.

The alarming thing about this Senate report is that on page 12 the report uses as an argument the range in administrative costs from 2.4 percent in Texas to 14.1 percent in New York. This points up some very faulty reasoning.

You will note on the enclosed chart that Texas has 383 people out of every 1,000 population over 65 years of age on old-age assistance. New York has only 78, the national average is 190, and Connecticut has only 84. Careful analysis of this chart will show that such States as Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, which try successfully to keep ineligible people off the public assistance rolls, have the highest administrative costs. I am convinced that there is a definite correlation between high administrative cost percentage-wise and low incidence on the public-assistance programs. In contrast to the Northern States mentioned above you will find Texas, Louisiana, and most of the Southern States operating mainly on a pension idea. They, therefore, have very large percentages of their populations on assistance, which of course costs the Federal Government money in assistance grants.

An arbitrary 7 percent limitation seems to me to be very discriminatory against those States which do an honest job in granting assistance only to those people deserving of it.

I sincerely hope that this part of Report No. 1623 can be defeated on the Senate floor.

Respectfully yours,

HOWARD E. HOUSTON,
Commissioner of Welfare.

P. S.—An identical letter has been sent to Senator PURTELL.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PURTELL. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I wish to make an explanation which may probably allay some of the concerns and fears that a number of Senators have expressed to those of us who serve on the committee, because since the committee's action on the bill, we have heard from State welfare directors and, in some instances, the administrators and governors of many States. For that reason, I desire to make an explanation as to why the committee took the action it did in restricting the item to not to exceed 7 percent, because the item came before the committee in the third supplemental appropriation bill, H. R. 8481.

The House had imposed a modest cut in the supplemental request for \$58 million, and had added a limitation on the amount which could be used for administrative costs. The Senate committee

restored the House cut and struck out the limitation, but in its report called attention to the variances among the several States in the costs of administration, and promised that the matter would have further attention during the consideration of the regular appropriation bill for the Department. The amendment under discussion was the outcome of this consideration.

Since the committee report was filed, I have received numerous inquiries from my colleagues, as have other members of our committee, including the chairman, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. A number of Senators have asked that the committee amendment be not adopted.

I think the attention of the Senate and of State administrative officials has been forcefully called to the problem, and that serious study will be given to remedying any defects which may exist.

I shall expect the staff of the committee to make a thorough study and investigation of the variations in the administrative costs among the several States, and I hope that the chairman of the committee will approve of such action.

I may say that I have discussed the subject with the Senator from New Hampshire, who has stated that he will instruct the staff of the Committee on Appropriations to make a complete study of the problem, because an examination of the percentages in the so-called administrative costs in the various States discloses a range from a low of 2.4 percent to a high of 14.1 percent. It was that factor which impelled the House to make a restriction in the first instance. Then the Senate committee, in a sense, restored the cut in the supplemental bill. But it was agreed that the Senate would go into the question further. So the 7 percent limitation was included for no other purpose than to call the situation to the attention of the Senate, in order to bring up the question for discussion and study, because if there were any undue administrative expense charged to the fund, the committee ultimately would have information about it and would correct the situation.

I wish to say that there is no intention on the part of the chairman of the full committee or the chairman of the subcommittee to resist the effort to have the amendment, which is simply a language amendment, stricken. It was for that reason that I did not desire to have the amendments agreed to en bloc. I wanted Senators to have the benefit of propounding questions and entering into a discussion of the situation.

The committee is ready to aid Senators in striking the amendment, because the amendment has accomplished the purpose of calling everyone's attention to the inconsistency in the administrative expenses of the various States.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. PURTELL. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I wish to express my commendation of the sentiments just expressed by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. I have received a complaint from the agency, in which they

were not speaking of the 7 percent, but agreed with the substitute as suggested by the Senator. They think that the basic social-security law should reflect the final decision reached.

I am not at this moment making any claim of conflicting jurisdiction, but I may say that the Committee on Finance is now holding hearings on social security, and it will always be appropriate to bring up the subject before the committee. It might be appropriate to consider the question in connection with the basic law, rather than in relation to an appropriation bill.

I express my appreciation of the willingness of the Senator from Minnesota to drop the amendment for the time being.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PURTELL. I am happy to yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I desire to commend the Senator from Connecticut for bring the matter before the Senate. I think if Senators will read pages 1177, 1178, 1179, and 1180 of the hearings, they will observe that the committee had good reason to act as it did in this particular bill. Some of the costs of administration are almost unbelievable. They go as high as 44.9 percent. While many of the costs of administration are low, I think it will be found, overall, that many run very high.

In the different departments, the administrative cost varies from State to State. That is true with respect to aid to the blind. The same will be found in the case of aid to dependent children. Similarly, the costs vary in the cases of old-age assistance and aid to the disabled. There is a large discrepancy in administrative costs from State to State in the different categories.

I think the proper course of action is to do as the committee, on the floor, has now agreed to do, namely, to make a study of the cause of great discrepancy, in order to see if the problem cannot be solved.

Again, I wish to commend the Senator from Connecticut for bringing the subject to our attention, and to thank the Senator from Minnesota for agreeing to strike out the proviso at this time.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. PURTELL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I, too, wish to thank the Senator from Connecticut for having presented the amendment, because in some of the States this item has worked a hardship, with respect to some of the titles. It happens that in my State it has worked fairly well in connection with some titles, but title IV was an exception.

I especially wish to thank the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Connecticut for their cooperative attitude and splendid work in connection with the preparation of the entire bill. It is one of the finest, most constructive pieces of legislation on which I have worked, and which I have ever seen a subcommittee undertake.

Mr. THYE. I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from Mississippi for his kind remarks. This is a bill as to which it is difficult to be certain when sufficient funds have been provided and when amounts should be cut, because it deals principally with human beings and their welfare and benefits. It is not like an appropriation for road construction, or something of that kind. In this instance, we are dealing with factors which affect human beings, whether it is for research or for administrative funds affecting their welfare. It is difficult to carry this bill through the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President—

Mr. PURTELL. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, first of all, I should like to say, on behalf of the people of California, that they, too, wish to express their thanks for the generous and fair acquiescence of the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, in recognizing the virtues of the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut, whom I wish to congratulate for bringing the matter before the Senate today.

As is the case with many of the Senators sitting in the Chamber this afternoon, I too, have received urgent communications from the director of social welfare of the State of California, as well as from those representing county governments in California. It is true that had a restrictive amendment such as this with respect to administrative costs been adopted by the Senate and had it become the law, it would have materially handicapped many of the States in finding moneys to carry on the entire program of social security.

I wish to have the RECORD indicate that, in the case of California, had the amendment been adopted there would have been almost a 50-percent decrease in the Federal participation in the administration of the program in California. At the present time the Federal share in administrative costs to California is \$5,238,809 annually. Under the proposed amendment this share would be reduced to \$2,604,821—a reduction and loss to my State of \$2,633,988 annually.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, in order that the RECORD may be perfectly clear, I wish to state that the provision related only to the administrative expense, and did not deny one cent of Federal funds in matching any official funds which would be available. The only reason why the provision was inserted in the bill was that we wanted to call the attention of everyone to the effect of the language. The provision would have affected my State just as much as it would have affected every other State which has been mentioned. In my State the welfare director immediately wrote me, because it would have affected my State not only in the one item, but in three items regarding the welfare program.

There was need for the Senate to give thought to the question. Therefore, we left the language in the bill in order to provoke this very discussion and study.

As chairman of the subcommittee, acting for the full committee, I am agreeing that the Senate should not act favorably on the amendment. It has served its purpose.

Mr. President, if there is insistence on rejection of the committee amendment, my colleagues, will find no opposition on my part to such a suggestion.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I urge that the committee amendment be rejected, and I wish to thank the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate for very long. I merely wish to say that the Senate does have the power to consider changing the law with respect to administrative expenses and funds which are granted to the States under the old-age insurance program or any other type of program in which the Federal Government participates. The States of the American Union, and those who administer the program in the several States, should have ample knowledge so that they may put their houses in order fiscal-wise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 28, beginning in line 24.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 6, to strike "\$1,450,000" and insert "\$1,550,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Secretary," on page 31, line 9, after the word "Secretary", to strike out "\$1,075,000" and insert "\$1,150,000", and in line 12, after the word "fund", to strike out the colon and "Provided, That not more than \$200,000 additional may be transferred to this head from other appropriations."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 18, after the word "Audits", to strike out "\$1,775,000" and insert "\$1,835,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 8, to insert:

Working capital fund: The working capital fund established in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1953 (66 Stat. 369), shall be available for financing the additional functions of central accounting service and central internal audit service.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$75,000" and insert "\$105,000, of which \$45,000 shall be available only to the National Institutes of Health."

The amendment was agreed to.

PROPOSED COUGAR DAM

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield, so that I may address an inquiry to him?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Is the Senator from Oregon going to take some time?

Mr. MORSE. Only half a minute.

Mr. THYE. I was about to inform the Senator that we are almost through with action on the amendments.

Mr. MORSE. I shall take only about half a minute, in order to make an insertion in the RECORD.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, at an appropriate place, a telegram which I received today from the Eugene Water Board in regard to the proposed Cougar Dam, and a telegram setting forth my answer of opposition to the Eugene Water Board's position on the Cougar Dam, with a request in the message that the Eugene Water Board provide me at an early date with an analysis of the Eugene Water Board's contract with the Bonneville Power Administration in respect to the effect of the April 7 order of the Secretary of the Interior on that contract.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EUGENE, OREG., June 21, 1954.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building:

Your statement in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 17, opposing Eugene Water and Electric Board plans to construct and operate the power facilities in the Cougar project has been called to our attention. We wish to call your attention to the following facts concerning our participation in the Cougar project.

Extensive and comprehensive economic studies of the feasibility of adding power facilities to the Cougar flood-control dam were made by the water board staff and by expert outside consultants before we submitted the partnership proposal embodied in the present Cougar legislation. The outside consultants were Cornell, Howland, Hayes & Merrifield, of Corvallis, Oreg.; Morrison Knudson Contractors, of Boise, Idaho; the International Engineering Co., of San Francisco.

The proposed installed capacity of 39,000 kilowatts will be firm power in our system. Please note that firm power is distinguished from prime power. Prime power is available continuously. Cougar will supply firm power for approximately 10 hours per day. The operation of the project would be geared to the needs of irrigation, the maintenance of stream flow, and of the available water during the dry season. The powerplant could be shut down during weekends to conserve water if necessary.

We do have definite preliminary estimates of the cost of power from Cougar. We have not yet supplied these figures to the Bonneville Power Administration. We have made definite arrangements to do this in the immediate future. The cost of firm energy from Cougar under water board operation is estimated to be 3.7 mills per kilowatt-hour under present costs and plans. The cost to us of equivalent firm energy from the Bonneville Power Administration would be 4.2 mills per kilowatt-hour at present Bonneville rates.

Cougar project was recommended for construction by Corps of Engineers as a part of the integrated development of the Columbia Basin. Construction and operation of the power facilities by the Eugene Water and Electric Board would in no way adversely affect the integrated plan but would accelerate its progress.

Operation of space for flood control and release of water for downstream benefits would be under the direction of the Corps of Engineers in any case.

Power generated would be a benefit to the entire area including the Northwest power pool. Regarding the operation of the Northwest power pool, Eugene's system is permanently connected to the pool and the capacity of our municipal electric generating facilities would simply add to the supply available in the Northwest. If the power available to other utilities power which Eugene does not draw from the pool, the chairman of the Pacific Northwest Utilities conference committee, the operating arm of the pool, has submitted a statement to Congress which emphatically says the operation of the Cougar power plant by the Eugene Water and Electric Board would materially increase the effectiveness of the pool.

As of this date we have spent approximately \$41,000 on this project. Our proposal has been submitted to Congress with the firm conviction that the construction and operation of the Cougar power facilities by the Eugene Water and Electric Board will in part meet the needs of this rapidly growing area and is sound from engineering, economic, and financial standpoints.

Copies of this telegram are being sent Senator EDWARD MARTIN, chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, and to Senator CORDON. Other copies will be released locally.

EUGENE WATER AND ELECTRIC BOARD,
LIONEL W. TROMMLITZ, President.

JUNE 25, 1954.

EUGENE WATER AND ELECTRIC BOARD,
Eugene, Oreg.:

Thank you for your wire of June 22. I shall place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today and shall also submit it to the Senate Public Works Committee. It in no way answers the point which I raised in my Senate statement on June 17. You are asking for construction approval of a project before you submit to the Congress accurate and full information on comparative costs and comparative rates as between your proposed partnership plan and construction of the entire project by the Federal Government with power sales through Bonneville. You do not meet the issue of the effect of McKay's April 7 order on new projects such as the proposed Cougar project. I respectfully request that you submit to me at an early date an analysis of your contract with Bonneville as it relates to the April 7 order. It is my judgment that the Cougar Dam bill you are urging, in its present form, is not in the best interest of the people of the Eugene area to be served by the project or the State of Oregon. The Cougar Dam bill which I have introduced keeps faith with the long-established Federal power policy, and I regret that interests in my home community are proposing a plan which, in my judgment, will serve as a precedent for turning over the rivers of our State to selfish interests thereby jeopardizing the possibility of providing the people of our State with more cheap power.

WAYNE MORSE.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WEL- FARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1955

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9447), making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was on page 33, after line 21, to insert:

SEC. 207. In order to more effectively administer the programs and functions of the Department, the Secretary is authorized to transfer not to exceed 1 percent of any appropriation in this title available for salaries and expenses to any other such appropriation but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 1 percent by any such transfer: *Provided*, That no such transfers shall be used for the creation of new functions within the Department, nor shall the total amount transferred in fiscal year 1955 exceed \$100,000.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 13, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "\$422,000" and insert "\$429,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, that completes the committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there further amendments to be offered?

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I have discussed with the chairman of the subcommittee the amendment I am about to propose.

I offer an amendment on page 21, in line 19, to strike out "\$3,295,000", and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,565,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 21, in line 19, it is proposed to strike out "\$3,295,000" and insert in lieu thereof \$3,565,000."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, as I understand, the amount would be increased by \$270,000?

Mr. BRICKER. Yes; and it is for the purpose of carrying out the intention of the Congress to create a memorial for the late distinguished majority leader and my colleague, Senator Taft.

Mr. THYE. It is recognized that the House made a reduction in that item; and that if the reduction were adhered to and funds were taken from administrative funds, it would leave the administrative funds—

Mr. BRICKER. In a depleted condition.

Mr. THYE. Yes.

Mr. BRICKER. And the memorial could not be a complete operating unit and have an adequate staff.

Mr. THYE. That is true. There is, however, a question involved concerning the entire structure, which is that the construction is going to be more expensive than it was anticipated it would be when the first authorization was approved.

Mr. BRICKER. That is true, and it is due to the increased costs of construction being encountered.

Mr. THYE. Also, a little broader use of the building in general is to be made than was at first anticipated.

Mr. BRICKER. That is true.

Mr. THYE. That is one reason why I have no objection to the amendment. The understanding was that if \$270,000 more were to be expended for the construction of the building there would be a reduction in other administrative funds. If such reduction were imposed upon the administrative funds, the activities of the division involved would be curtailed to the point where the service would be greatly reduced. Therefore,

I am willing to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. BRICKER. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Minnesota, and, on behalf of the people of Ohio, I thank him for the tribute to my distinguished late colleague.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement I have prepared.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BRICKER

Last year this body joined with the House in voting that a great new laboratory at Cincinnati, Ohio, which is devoted to improving the health of this Nation through research, should be named for that illustrious son of Cincinnati, our late colleague and friend, Bob Taft.

This laboratory of the Public Health Service is now known as Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center.

On page 21 of the bill the item of "engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene" carries funds for this work and some other activities.

This laboratory, authorized in 1948, was caught in the squeeze on construction costs occasioned by the Korean war. Its fourth floor was left uncompleted. One elevator was omitted although the shaft was constructed.

The House wisely wished to see this building completed.

Its method, however, leaves something to be desired. It wrote into its bill that some of these operating funds for "engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene" should be used to complete the building.

I am told that the only new item in this sum is one of \$132,500 to increase the staff to man Taft Center. Mr. President, I do not have to remind my colleagues that when a budget is cut it is a new item which comes out.

Indeed I am told that if the bill remains as written, the agency will find itself compelled not only to forgo plans for expanding its staff to fit the big new building but actually to cut back on what it now has.

I understand, also, that there were difficulties about bringing this situation to the attention of the Senate committee. The subcommittee headed by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota had completed its hearings on this item when the House committee reported and the House acted, making it difficult for the Senate committee to be told the full effects.

Mr. President, I do not believe I need remind my colleagues that I seldom come before this body to ask for increased spending.

On the other hand, it seems to me highly illogical that we should name a great laboratory for so logical man as Bob Taft, then complete it but leave it half empty.

My amendment would simply add enough money to complete the building while leaving the operating funds intact.

I hope my friends of the committee will join me in seeing that Taft Center not only is completed but is operated fully.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 21, line 19, proposed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there is no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 9447) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. THYE, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. HILL conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the votes by which the amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time and passed be reconsidered, so that I may offer an important amendment which has been on my desk. The amendment proposes to change the Administrator of the Old-Age Assistance Act from a rating of GS-16 to a rating of GS-18. The amendment was discussed with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service; and I wish to have the amendment considered and acted upon, for it would be an injustice not to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Minnesota? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I thank the Senate; and I now offer and send to the desk the amendment to which I have referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 28, in line 15, after the word "fund", it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided, That the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare hereafter is authorized, subject to the procedures prescribed by section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, to place the position of Director, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, in grade GS-18 in the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949, and such position shall be in addition to those positions in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare presently allocated in grade GS-18: Provided further, That this proviso shall be effective only upon enactment into law, during the second session of the 83d Congress, of S. 2665: Provided further, That the position described herein shall be allocated to the numerical limitations contained in S. 2665."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 9447) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amend-

ments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. THYE, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. HILL conferees on the part of the Senate.

ACCURACY AND PURPOSE OF CERTAIN FIGURES AND AMENDMENTS IN CONNECTION WITH REA APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on June 1, when the Senate was considering the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] offered an amendment to increase by the amount of \$35 million the appropriation for the REA; and he coupled the amendment with a sharp attack upon the REA Administrator, Mr. Ancher Nelsen, and also the Eisenhower administration.

At that time I seriously questioned the accuracy of the figures which were being used by the Senator from Illinois and which, according to his statement, he had received from the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. I also indicated that in my opinion politics was involved in the maneuvering that was going on, inasmuch as both the Senate and the House Appropriations Committees had stated plainly that such an additional appropriation for the REA for the fiscal year 1955 was unnecessary.

My fears that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois would be used for political purposes, for the purpose of establishing a criterion on which to attempt to show whether each Member was for or against the REA, were fully justified. For—almost immediately thereafter—there appeared in the American Federation of Labor Newsletter a sharp attack upon the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], who voted against this unnecessary appropriation of funds, as proposed; and in the Newsletter the statement is made that that is one reason why the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] should be defeated in his campaign for reelection to the Senate, and why his Democratic opponent in the State of Oregon should be elected to the Senate. So my fears that the amendment of the Senator from Illinois was being used for political purposes were well founded.

I care not how much anyone may undertake to build up the REA record of the Senator from Illinois; but I do object seriously to the use of an amendment such as the one he proposed as a criterion on which to judge the position of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] or the position of any other Member of the Senate.

As I have said, I questioned both the accuracy of the figures used—I thought they were misleading; and they were—and the use of the amendment for political purposes.

Several days later, I had a visit from two young men from the National Rural

Electric Cooperative Association, here in Washington, Mr. Fain and Mr. Kabat. I had made reference to certain telegrams that, over the name of Mr. Ellis, were sent to managers of REA cooperatives throughout the country, asking them to send telegrams to their Members of Congress. Mr. Fain informed me that he took full responsibility for that action; that he had sent the telegrams without the knowledge of Mr. Ellis, although he thought Mr. Ellis would approve of them; and I think he did.

Mr. Kabat said he was responsible for the figures which were submitted to Congress in an effort to gain further large appropriations—unnecessary appropriations, Mr. President—for the REA for the fiscal year 1955.

I may say that Mr. Ellis was with me in my office after the two young men left. Apparently they were a little unsatisfied; and Mr. Ellis visited me and wanted me to make a correction and to withdraw any intimation that he would be involved in politics in that way.

Later on, under date of June 18, he wrote a letter, addressed to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and myself, in which Mr. Ellis appealed to us as statesmen to do the proper thing by him.

Yesterday, the Senator from Illinois inserted the letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and also inserted a statement which Mr. Ellis furnished him, which was intended to justify the figures Mr. Ellis had submitted, for his organization, to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

The Senator from Illinois also inserted that statement from Mr. Ellis in the RECORD, as of yesterday.

I have prepared a documented reply to the statement of Mr. Ellis, executive manager of NRECA, which was inserted in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I ask unanimous consent to have this documented reply printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, because this reply will show conclusively that the figures which were submitted by Mr. Ellis and his assistant, Mr. Kabat, to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate, were misleading, and that they presented an erroneous picture of the situation. I feel that the position which they took should be put in its proper light before the Congress and the people of the country.

There being no objection, the reply was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Refer to page 151 of the House hearings. Also, refer to page 1094 and 1095 of the Senate hearings.

On these pages there is a tabulation which was cited and is now cited as an example of the misleading picture that can be created in the indiscriminate use of 18-month and 12-month figures.

Examination of the tabulation will reveal that it is a fact that figures representing applications for an 18-month period are compared to loan funds available for 12 months. Whether so intended or not, this phony comparison tended to overemphasize the real need for loan funds.

There is no intention to impugn the honesty and integrity of the NRECA board members who appeared before the Appropriations Committee. It is obvious to everybody they did not compile the tabulation and for any-

one to imply that a questioning of the phony comparison is an attack on the sound and public-spirited men who represent the REA cooperatives cannot be anything but a smokescreen.

Before both the Senate and the House Appropriations Committees the Mr. Kabat, representing Mr. Ellis, presented data by States on applications pending in the field and in Washington, and compared the total to the maximum amount which could be made available to each State during fiscal year 1955. This comparison overlooks the amounts to be loaned in each State during the remainder of fiscal year 1954 from 1954 funds. These are considerable amounts in many of the States. The following data are presented by NRECA for 7 States on page 151 of the House hearings:

State	Total applications pending in both Washington and in the field	Total amount which can be made available to State according to provision of REA Act and budgetary request of REA
Alabama.....	\$7,215,000	\$12,294,500
Colorado.....	16,710,000	9,834,750
Illinois.....	17,367,000	10,442,300
Missouri.....	15,550,000	11,615,550
New Mexico.....	13,781,000	10,091,750
Tennessee.....	7,380,500	11,149,000
Texas.....	20,405,425	13,214,650

These figures indicate that the funds available are not sufficient to satisfy applications from Colorado, Illinois, Missouri, New Mexico, and Texas. This is true if 1955 funds are considered the only funds available. But the fact is, that to satisfy the applications here mentioned, funds also are available from half of the fiscal year 1954—from January 1 through June 30. On that basis the funds available—that is, for the last half of 1954 and all of 1955—actually exceed total applications pending as reported by Mr. Kabat for each of the seven States. This is shown in the following table:

State	Total applications pending in the field and in Washington as reported by NRECA	Total amount available Jan. 1, 1954 to June 30, 1955 under 1955 printed budget plus unobligated 1954 funds	Excess of amount available over total applications pending as reported by NRECA
Alabama.....	\$7,215,000	\$28,399,420	\$21,184,420
Colorado.....	16,710,000	22,617,170	5,907,170
Illinois.....	17,367,000	25,037,820	7,670,820
Missouri.....	15,550,000	28,190,570	12,640,570
New Mexico.....	13,781,000	22,653,170	8,872,170
Tennessee.....	7,380,500	27,541,020	20,160,520
Texas.....	20,405,425	25,662,870	5,257,445

Mr. Ellis says that the calculations in the tabulations were made to point up inequities in the allotment formula of the Rural Electrification Act. Irrespective of the purpose, comparing 18-month and 12-month figures is inexcusable. It is clear that the purpose of such a comparison was to indicate an alleged need for a substantial increase in loan authorizations for fiscal year 1955.

Refer to page 1098 of the Senate hearings for testimony that Mr. Kabat in his effort to establish a shortage of funds, ignored funds available for the last half of fiscal year 1954. He says:

"For instance, in the State of Missouri, they had applications pending totaling \$15½ million. But under the REA budget request they could get only \$11½ million in loan funds. Under our request they could get \$23½ million. Under the amount approved by the House they could get \$15 million.

"In other words, they would be short both under the REA budget request and the

amount approved by the House, assuming all those loans are actually valid."

The fact is that the total amount available to the State of Missouri for the 18-month period, as estimated by REA, is \$28,190,000, or an excess of \$12,640,570 over pending applications as estimated by Mr. Kabat.

Refer to page 151 of the House hearings where shortage of funds is again stressed. Mr. Kabat says:

"Colorado has applications pending totaling almost \$17 million—\$16,710,000. According to the funds REA has available and provisions of the act, Colorado could get almost \$10 million in loan funds—in other words, there would be a deficiency of almost \$7 million.

"And then I can go on down the table and point out the position of some of these others, and you can see that this REA budget request is a pretty serious matter."

The fact is that the total amount available to the State of Colorado for the 18-month period, as estimated by REA, is \$22,617,170, or an excess of \$5,907,170 over pending applications as estimated by Mr. Kabat.

The above statements by Mr. Kabat would seem to be at variance with certain statements of Mr. Ellis in the attachment to his letter to Senators ARKEN and DOUGLAS dated June 18, 1954. Mr. Ellis says:

"The answer to this charge is that this second table was not the basis for NRECA's request for loan funds and was not so used. This table had no relationship to the amount of NRECA loan-fund request. Nor is it erroneous. This table showed only the effect of the restrictive provisions of the State allocations formula in the REA Act assuming congressional approval of the various budgetary request (REA or NRECA) or of the amount approved by the House. The only purpose of this table was to show how the outmoded restrictive provisions of this formula in the REA Act would limit, State by State, the amount of funds which could be borrowed in those States under a given amount of loan authorizations."

Mr. Kabat used the table to plead for more money. Mr. Ellis said the table had no relationship with his budget request. Certainly they cannot both be right.

Mr. Ellis has tried to picture his loan application survey figures as conservative.

Let us refer to page 6991 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 1, 1954. Therein in the second column a tabulation is printed entitled, "Applications estimated by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association annual survey compared with applications actually received by the REA—selected years."

An examination of the testimony Mr. Ellis gave to the Appropriations Committees in those "selected years" reveals that for some reason or other, he did not give a breakdown of his survey figures, with one exception, until this year. This exception was on March 10, 1949.

On March 10, 1949, as revealed on page 997 of part II of the hearings before the House Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations for the agricultural appropriation bill for 1950, Mr. Ellis stated:

"We would make additional applications during the balance of this fiscal year (Jan. 1, 1949–June 30, 1949) totaling about \$180 million. We would make further applications during the next fiscal year (July 1, 1949–June 30, 1950) totaling approximately \$350 million."

Add these two figures together. The total is \$530 million. That is the figure used on March 10, 1949, as representing "applications which the rural electric expect to make."

In May 1954 Mr. Ellis compiled a table going back to January 1, 1949.

This same item—the applications which the rural electric expect to make January

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued June 29, 1954
For actions of June 28, 1954
83rd-2nd, No. 119

CONTENTS

Animal disease.....11	Imports.....10,11	Roads.....24
Appropriations....4,8,9,14	Insect control.....5	Small business.....21
Budgeting.....34	Labor, farm.....18	Soil conservation.15,33,36
Copper.....10	Legislative program....20	Surplus commodities...2,36
Corporations.....23	Loans, farm.....26	Taxation.....15,20,24
Dairy industry....28,30,36	Marketing.....36	Trade, foreign.....3,25
Education.....6,22	Personnel.....19,27	Transportation.....12,16
Electrification.....32	Plant disease.....5	Unemployment compensation
Farm program.....28,36	Prices, parity.....36	27
Food, distribution.....36	Price supports	Veterans' benefits.....22
Food, supply.....36	13,28,30,31,36	Virgin Islands.....11
Foreign aid.....1,2	Public debt.....35	Wheat.....29
Forestry.....17	Reclamation.....7	Wool.....36
Honey.....36		

HIGHLIGHTS: House debated foreign aid bill. House acted on amendments to trade agreements bill. Conferees announced agreement on surplus commodities bill. Senate debated tax revision bill. Sen. Millikin discussed soil conservation provision. Both Houses agreed to conference report on Interior appropriation bill. Senate passed legislative-judiciary appropriation bill. Sen. Anderson recommended earmarking of forest receipts for recreation. Senate committee reported life insurance bill for Federal employees. House received USDA proposal to authorize cooperation with Canada and Mexico in insect control.

HOUSE

1. FOREIGN AID. Began debate on H. R. 9678, the foreign aid authorization bill, which had been reported on June 25 during House recess (H. Rept. 1925)(pp. 8665, 8622, 8624-60). The bill authorizes appropriations for the fiscal year 1955, for military aid, economic development assistance, and technical cooperation.
2. SURPLUS COMMODITIES. On June 26, during House recess, the conferees agreed to file a report on S. 2475, to aid in disposal of surplus commodities, but the report was not actually submitted. The "Daily Digest" states: "Among other agreements made, the conferees agreed to reduce the total amount to be sold from \$1 billion to \$700 million, and to retain \$300 million for famine relief." (p. D750.)
3. TRADE AGREEMENTS. Concurred in the Senate amendment to the trade agreements bill, H. R. 9474, providing that this bill indicates no congressional decision on GATT, and concurred with an amendment to the Senate amendment to provide that no trade agreement shall endanger defense production (pp. 8660-1).
4. INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 8680, and acted on amendments in disagreement (pp. 8614-18, 8592-5). This bill will now be sent to the President.

AND PLANT-DISEASE

5. INSECT/CONTROL. Received from this Department a proposed bill to authorize cooperation with Mexico and Canada in the control of incipient or emergency outbreaks of insect pests or plant diseases in those countries; to Agriculture Committee (p. 8665).
6. EDUCATION. The Education and Labor Committee reported with amendment H. R. 9640, to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act so as to promote and assist in the extension and improvement of the program (H. Rept. 1941)(p. 8665).
7. RECLAMATION. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported with amendment H. R. 236, to authorize the Fryingpan-Arkansas project (H. Rept. 1943), and without amendment S. J. Res. 165, to authorize the Glendo unit, Wyo. (H. Rept. 1944)(p. 8665).
8. D. C. APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955. Received the conference report on this bill, H. R. 9517 (H. Rept. 1945)(pp. 8612-14).
9. LABOR-HEW APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955. House conferees were appointed on this bill, H. R. 9447 (p. 8614). Senate conferees have been appointed.
10. COPPER IMPORTS. Concurred in the Senate amendment to H. R. 7709, to continue duty-free copper imports for 1 more year (p. 8620). This bill will now be sent to the President.
11. VIRGIN ISLANDS. House conferees were appointed on S. 3378, to revise the Virgin Islands organic act, which includes a provision regarding importation of diseased animals (p. 8620). Senate conferees have been appointed.
12. TRANSPORTATION. Rep. Oakman claimed there are "discriminatory tolls on interstate truck transportation" (pp. 8622-5).
13. PRICE SUPPORTS. Rep. Thompson, La., spoke against reduction in price supports (p. 8662).

SENATE

14. LEGISLATIVE-JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955. Passed with amendments this bill, H. R. 9302 (pp. 8595-607). Senate conferees were appointed. Agreed to an amendment by Sen. Mundt to validate obligations under any regular annual appropriation act between June 30, 1954, and the date of its approval (p.8598). Rejected an amendment by Sen. Carlson to enable the Joint Committee on the Economic Report to continue the publication of monthly "Economic Indicators" (pp. 8600-2).
15. TAXATION. Began debate on H. R. 8300, the general tax revision bill. Adopted committee amendments en bloc so that the bill, as so amended, will be considered as the original text for the purpose of further amendment. (pp. 8536-89, 8602, 8607-9.)

Sen. Millikin discussed the soil conservation provision which allows farmers to deduct expenditures (as expense rather than capitalization) for soil and water conservation, including those for leveling, grading, terracing, drainage, contour furrowing, eradication of brush, planting of windbreaks, and other expenses for treatment or moving of earth. The Senate committee modified the House bill to make it clear that the provision applies to earthen dams not subject to depreciation and to the construction as well as the control and protection of watercourses, outlets, and ponds. The committee also made the provision applicable for expenditures by farmers to satisfy special assessments

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 1.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 22, 25, 29, 30, 32, 34, 35 and 41, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$307,565"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,945,522"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$27,626,570"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$6,266,641"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,163,410"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$22,636,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,378,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$25,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,238,365"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$235,406"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$9,732,740"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 4, 8, 14, 15, 17, 20, 23, 33, 36, 37, 38, 39 and 40.

EARL WILSON,
CHARLES W. VURSELL,
OAKLEY HUNTER,
W. F. NORRELL,
A. M. FERNANDEZ,

Managers on the Part of the House.

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
HOMER FERGUSON,
JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY,
FRANCIS CASE,
LISTER HILL,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9517) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

OPERATING EXPENSES

Executive Office

Amendment No. 1: Strikes out Senate language appropriating funds for the National Capital Wing, Civil Air Patrol.

Amendment No. 2: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates \$307,565 instead of \$258,215 as proposed by the House and \$317,565 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4: Reported in disagreement.

Department of General Administration

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates \$2,945,522 instead of \$2,877,522 as proposed by the House and \$2,965,522 as proposed by the Senate. Of the increase above the House figure, \$40,000 is for personal services including funds for additional assessors.

Office of Corporation Counsel

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates \$428,585 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$360,000 as proposed by the House.

Regulatory agencies

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates \$918,204 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$891,021 as proposed by the House.

Department of Occupations and Professions

Amendment No. 8: Reported in disagreement. While the House conferees will offer a motion to recede and concur in this amendment, House and Senate conferees direct that the District of Columbia obtain legislative authority for fixing the rates of compensation for Board members before the 1956 bill is considered.

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates \$264,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$225,000 as proposed by the House.

Public schools

Amendment No. 10: Inserts Senate language permitting the purchase of supplies.

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates \$27,626,570 instead of \$27,526,570 as proposed by the House and \$27,692,574 as proposed by the Senate. Of the increase provided above the House figure, \$25,000 is for the driver

training program; \$45,000 is for additional teachers; \$15,000 is for supplies; and \$15,000 is for general administration.

Public Library

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates \$1,611,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,598,500 as proposed by the House.

Recreation Department

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates \$1,641,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,626,402 as proposed by the House.

Metropolitan Police

Amendment No. 14: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 15: Reported in disagreement.

Fire Department

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates \$6,266,641 instead of \$6,259,641 as proposed by the House and \$6,309,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House figure is for supplies and equipment.

Office of Civil Defense

Amendment No. 17: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates \$150,000 instead of \$75,000 as proposed by the House and \$179,048 as proposed by the Senate.

Courts

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates \$3,163,410 instead of \$3,133,410 as proposed by the House and \$3,191,145 as proposed by the Senate.

Department of Public Health

Amendment No. 20: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates \$22,636,000 instead of \$22,336,000 as proposed by the House and \$22,761,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Public welfare

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates \$8,885,061 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$8,851,516 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 23: Reported in disagreement.

Department of Licenses and Inspections

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates \$1,378,000 instead of \$1,175,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,415,315 as proposed by the Senate. Of the amount of increase above the House figure \$128,000 represents a transfer of funds from the Public Health Department appropriation to cover employment of sanitary inspectors in connection with the slum clearance program.

Department of Highways

Amendment No. 25: Provides that \$3,761,612 shall be payable from the Highway fund as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,859,285 as proposed by the House.

Department of Vehicles and Traffic

Amendment No. 26: Provides \$25,000 for traffic safety education instead of \$20,000 as proposed by the House and \$30,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 27, 28 and 29: Appropriate \$1,238,365 instead of \$1,124,365 as proposed by the House and \$1,343,365 as proposed by the Senate, and provide that \$235,406 shall be payable from the motor vehicle parking fund and \$9,000 from the general fund.

Amendment No. 30: Strikes out House language relating to the purchase arrangements for parking meters or devices.

Department of Sanitary Engineering

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates \$9,732,740 instead of \$9,657,740 as proposed by the House and \$9,757,302 as proposed by the Senate.

National Capital Parks

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates \$2,344,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,227,500 as proposed by the House.

*CAPITAL OUTLAY**Public building construction*

Amendment No. 33: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 34 and 35: Appropriate \$15,712,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$15,685,000 as proposed by the House, and provide that \$631,400 shall be available for construction services by the Director of Buildings and Grounds, or by contract, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$630,320 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 36 and 37: Reported in disagreement.

Department of Highways

Amendment No. 38: Reported in disagreement.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendments Nos. 39 and 40: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 41: Changes section number as proposed by the Senate.

EARL WILSON,
CHARLES W. VURSELL,
OAKLEY HUNTER,
W. F. NORRELL,
A. M. FERNANDEZ,

Managers on the Part of the House.

APPROPRIATION BILL, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 9447) making appropriations for the Department of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: MESSRS. BUDGE, JENSEN, TABER, CLEVINGER, FOGARTY, FERNANDEZ, and CANNON.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 9447) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955 and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 8680) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement:

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1926)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8680) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 18, 21, 23, 43, 51, 59, 60, and 61.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 5, 12, 13, 15, 30, 34, 36, 39, 42, 45, 47, 48, 50, 55, 57, 62, and 66, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$145,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,765,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$23,314,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken, amended to read as follows: "Provided, That, during the current fiscal year, not more than \$6,250,000 of the funds available under this appropriation heading shall be used for personal services and not more than \$750,000 shall be used for travel expenses"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$6,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$11,913,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate number 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$59,547,215"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$12,881,245"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken, amended to read as follows: "That, during the current fiscal year, not more than \$3,800,000 of the funds available under this appropriation heading shall be available for personal services: *Provided further,*"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$126,637,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken, amended to read as follows: "Provided, That, during the current fiscal year, not more than \$26,000,000 of the funds available under this appropriation heading shall be available for personal services and not more than \$1,000,000 shall be available for travel"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$21,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$18,257,222"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$25,735,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$13,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued June 30, 1954
For actions of June 29, 1954
83rd-2nd, No. 120

CONTENTS

Agricultural appropriation	25	Foreign aid.....	3	Price supports.....	3,10,16,20
Appropriations.....	7,31,32	Fruits & vegetables.....	26	REA.....	16
Committees.....	14	Grain.....	17	Reclamation.....	13,36
Containers.....	26	Housing.....	28	Research.....	16,29
Dairy industry.....	6,20	Labor, farm.....	7,19,21	Social Security.....	19
Disbursing.....	27	Lands, transfer.....	29	Statistics.....	5,7
Education.....	15,16,24	Law revision.....	5	Surplus commodities.....	1,3
Electrification.....	33	Legislative program.....	2,15	Taxation.....	9,15
Extension work.....	29,30	Livestock and meats.....	5,17	Trade, foreign.....	8
farm income.....	9,16	Loans, farm.....	28	Transportation.....	12,23,34
farm program.....	2,10,17	Minerals.....	15,35	Unemployment compensation	4
Flood control.....	18	Personnel.....	4,7,11,23,27	Veterans' benefits.....	24
Food, distribution.....	3,16	Potatoes.....	22	Water resources.....	18
		Poultry.....	5		

HIGHLIGHTS: House received conference report on surplus commodities bill. House Rules Committee cleared farm program bill for debate today. House debated foreign aid bill and agreed to amendment requiring use of \$ $\frac{1}{2}$ billion for disposal of surplus commodities. House committees reported bills to extend unemployment compensation to Federal employees and to codify food-drug laws. House received conference reports on Labor-HEW and State, Justice, Commerce appropriation bills. Senate concurred in House amendment to trade agreements bill. Senate debated tax revision bill, and Sens. Douglas and Long discussed decrease in farm income. Rep. Budget introduced bill to require potato labeling and inspection. Rep. Herlong inserted Benson-Nixon radio discussion of farm program. President approved agricultural appropriation bill and bills to authorize 3/8 bushel basket and to continue housing program 1 mo. Sen. Aiken criticized charge that President promised 90% price supports.

HOUSE

1. SURPLUS COMMODITIES. Received the conference report on S. 2475, to authorize the President to use agricultural commodities to improve the foreign relations of the U. S. The conferees reduced from \$1,000,000,000 (House figure) to \$700,000,000 the amount under Title 1. The revised bill, as reported from conference, is printed in the Record (pp. 8673-5).
2. FARM PROGRAM. The Rules Committee reported a resolution providing for consideration of the farm program bill, H. R. 9680. The rule provides for 4 hours of general debate (before the bill is read for amendment under the 5-minute rule) and waives points of order. It is expected that debate on the bill will begin today following votes on the foreign aid bill and several conference reports on appropriation bills (pp. 8734, 8740, D755).
3. FOREIGN AID. Continued debate on H. R. 9678, to authorize a foreign aid program for the fiscal year 1955 (pp. 8676-740). Agreed to an amendment by Rep. Judd to require at least \$500 million of foreign aid funds to be used to finance the purchase and export of surplus agricultural commodities or products thereof and to require that foreign currency proceeds therefrom be used pursuant to the surplus commodities bill, S. 2475 (pp. 8733-4). Rep. Godley criticized

"operation reindeer" under which, he claimed, Christmas food packages were distributed in foreign countries (pp. 8729-30).

4. PERSONNEL. The Ways and Means Committee reported without amendment H. R. 9709, to extend and improve the unemployment compensation program, including its extension to Federal employees (H. Rept. 2001)(p. 8747).
5. LAW REVISION. The Judiciary Committee reported without amendment bills to revise, codify, and enact into positive law parts of the U. S. Code, as follows: H. R. 9723, title 21, "Food, Drugs, and Cosmetics" (including various provisions enforced by this Department regarding animals and poultry)(H. Rept. 1979); H. R. 9730, correction of obsolete references (H. Rept. 1981); and H. R. 9729, "Census" (H. Rept. 1980)(p. 8747).
6. DAIRY INDUSTRY. Rep. Johnson, Wis., commended the dairy products of Wis. (pp. 8670-1).

7. APPROPRIATIONS. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on H. R. 9517, the D. C. appropriation bill for 1955, and acted on amendments which had been reported in disagreement (pp. 8670, 8757). This bill will now be sent to the President. Received the conference report on H. R. 9203, the legislative-judiciary appropriation bill for 1955 (p. 8742). House conferees had been appointed earlier in the day (pp. 8669-70).

Received the conference report on H. R. 9447, the Labor-HEW appropriation bill (pp. 8742-4). The conferees agreed to \$50,000 (instead of \$100,000 as provided by the Senate amendment), under Bureau of Labor Standards, for improving conditions of migratory labor. The statement of House conferees includes the following: "The managers on the part of the House and Senate are disturbed by the lack of central coordination of the increasing activities in this field by many executive agencies. The managers believe that the expenditures of the same amount of Federal funds would result in a more effective program if these activities were more closely coordinated, and strongly urge that the 1956 budget for the executive branch be prepared with a view to correcting this deficiency," (pp. 8742-4.)

Received the conference report on H. R. 8067, the State, Justice, Commerce appropriation bill for 1955. The conferees struck out the provisions for additional supergrades in the State and Commerce Departments and agreed to the Senate provision limiting the Commerce Department's funds for management studies. The provision for a census of agriculture was reported in disagreement. Also reported in disagreement was the provision to create an additional position as Assistant Secretary of Commerce in lieu of the present position as Administrative Assistant Secretary of Commerce. (pp. 8744-6.)

SENATE

8. TRADE AGREEMENTS. Concurred in the House amendment to a Senate amendment to H. R. 9474, to extend until June 12, 1955, the authority of the President to enter into reciprocal trade agreements (pp. 8764-5). This bill will now be sent to the President.
9. TAXATION. Continued debate on H. R. 8300, the general tax revision bill (pp. 8761, 8774-96). Sens. Douglas and Long discussed the decrease in farm income (pp. 8780, 8783).
10. PRICE SUPPORTS. Sen. Aiken criticized the charge that the President promised 90% price supports during the 1952 campaign, and claimed that the President's speech at Kasson, Minn., was "doctored by deleting words and sentences until

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION,
AND WELFARE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955

JUNE 29, 1954.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. BUDGE, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 9447]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9447) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 7, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 20, 29, 32, 37, and 39.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 9, 12, 19, and 25 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$1,327,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: , of which not more than \$85,000 shall be for international labor affairs; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert *not to exceed \$50,000 for improving the conditions of migratory labor*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$722,500; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$4,705,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$6,116,500; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$635,000; the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$850,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$21,737,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$14,147,500; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$16,668,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$8,270,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$6,180,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$7,600,500; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$64,400,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$1,487,500; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$1,112,500; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: *Provided, That, except as may be otherwise provided for herein, not more than \$200,000 of the funds, including trust funds,*

appropriated by this title may be used at the Departmental level under authority of section 601 of the Act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417), as amended, and section 7 of Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 of 1953; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$1,800,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: *\$90,000, of which \$45,000 shall be available only to the National Institutes of Health;* and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$425,500; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 18 and 30. ||

HAMER H. BUDGE,
BEN F. JENSEN,
JOHN TABER,
CLIFF CLEVINGER,
JOHN E. FOGARTY,
A. M. FERNANDEZ,
CLARENCE CANNON,

Managers on the Part of the House.

EDWARD J. THYE,
STYLES BRIDGES,
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
LISTER HILL,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9447) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Amendment No. 1—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$1,327,000 instead of \$1,300,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,354,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2—*Salaries and expenses*: Restores language proposed by the House limiting amount available for international labor affairs and increases such amount to \$85,000 instead of \$60,000 as proposed by the House.

BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS

Amendment No. 3—*Salaries and expenses*: Provides not to exceed \$50,000 for improving the conditions of migratory labor instead of \$100,000 proposed by the Senate. The managers on the part of the House and Senate are disturbed by the lack of central coordination of the increasing activities in this field by many executive agencies. The managers believe that the expenditure of the same amount of Federal funds would result in a more effective program if these activities were more closely coordinated, and strongly urge that the 1956 budget for the executive branch be prepared with a view to correcting this deficiency.

Amendment No. 4—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$722,500 instead of \$665,000 as proposed by the House and \$780,000 as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

Amendment No. 5.—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$4,705,000 instead of \$4,650,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,760,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6.—*Salaries and expenses*: Strikes language proposed by the House and inserts language as proposed by the Senate to give the Department discretion in determining the total amount to be set aside for the Veterans' Employment Service.

Amendments Nos. 7 and 8.—*Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration*: Establish a contingency fund of \$16,400,000 as proposed by the House instead

of \$6,000,000 as proposed by the Senate and strike language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9.—*Salaries and expenses, Mexican farm-labor program*: Appropriates \$1,581,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,521,000 as proposed by the House.

WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

Amendment No. 10.—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$6,116,500 instead of \$6,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$6,233,000 as proposed by the Senate.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 11: Strikes language proposed by the Senate to provide authority to transfer funds between appropriations.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

Amendment No. 12—*Education of the blind*: Appropriates \$205,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$175,000 as proposed by the House.

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 13—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$5,100,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$5,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Amendment No. 14—*Payments to school districts*: Appropriates \$55,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$58,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15—*Payments to school districts*: Strikes language proposed by the Senate regarding the effective date of the 3-percent absorption feature of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, as amended.

OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Amendment No. 16—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$635,000 instead of \$620,000 as proposed by the House and \$650,000 as proposed by the Senate.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Amendment No. 17: Strikes language proposed by the Senate for the purpose of paying expenses for schooling for dependents of personnel stationed abroad under certain circumstances.

Amendment No. 18—*Tuberculosis*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 19—*Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene*. Appropriates \$3,565,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,295,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 20—*Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Territory of Alaska*: Restores language proposed by the House relating to the marine health units "Health" and "Hygiene".

Amendment No. 21—*Salaries and expenses, hospital-construction services*: Appropriates \$850,000 instead of \$750,000 as proposed by the House and \$950,000 as proposed by the Senate. In acting on this item the managers took into consideration the pending request for a supplemental appropriation of \$200,000 for this activity.

Amendment No. 22—*National Cancer Institute*: Appropriates \$21,737,000 instead of \$21,237,000 as proposed by the House and \$22,737,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23—*Mental-health activities*: Appropriates \$14,147,500 instead of \$13,460,000 as proposed by the House and \$14,460,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24—*National Heart Institute*: Appropriates \$16,668,000 instead of \$16,168,000 as proposed by the House and \$17,168,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 25—*Dental health activities*: Appropriates \$1,990,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,740,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 26—*Arthritis and metabolic disease activities*: Appropriates \$8,270,000 instead of \$7,270,000 as proposed by the House and \$9,270,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27—*Microbiology activities*: Appropriates \$6,180,000 instead of \$5,930,000 as proposed by the House and \$6,430,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 28—*Neurology and blindness activities*: Appropriates \$7,600,500 instead of \$6,913,000 as proposed by the House and \$8,413,000 as proposed by the Senate.

ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

Amendment No. 29—*Major repairs and preservation of buildings and grounds*: Strikes out language proposed by the Senate to provide for reimbursement of a portion of these expenses by the executive agencies and the District of Columbia using the facilities of the hospital.

Amendment No. 30—*Construction, maximum security building*: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur in the language of the Senate which provides \$110,000 for the preparation of tentative drawings for a maximum security building and for reimbursement of a pro rata share of the expenses of future construction by the District of Columbia with an amendment which would add to the latter provision the expenses of major repairs. In agreeing to this language the managers on the part of the House and the Senate anticipated a consolidation of appropriation items for future years to include under "Construction" all major repairs and to include under "Salaries and expenses" any minor items. The managers therefore desire that the budget for 1956 be prepared in this manner.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 31—*Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance*: Authorizes \$64,400,000 instead of \$64,150,000 as proposed by the House and \$64,650,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32—*Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance*: Strikes provision of the Senate relating to the position of Director, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance.

Amendment No. 33—*Grants to States for public assistance*: Appropriates \$1,487,500 instead of \$1,450,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,550,000 as proposed by the Senate.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Amendment No. 34—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$1,112,500 instead of \$1,075,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,150,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 35—*Salaries and expenses*: Restores, with perfecting language, the provision of the House limiting the transfer of funds for the performance of centralized activities at the departmental level.

Amendment No. 36—*Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Services*: Appropriates \$1,800,000 instead of \$1,775,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,835,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37—*Working capital fund*: Strikes language proposed by the Senate relating to the use of this fund for the additional functions of central accounting service and central internal audit service.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 38—*Section 204*: Provides a limitation of \$90,000 on the amount which may be used for expenses of travel to meetings instead of \$75,000 as proposed by the House and \$105,000 as proposed by the Senate and provides that \$45,000 of such limitation shall be available only to the National Institutes of Health as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 39: Strikes language proposed by the Senate to provide authority to transfer funds between appropriations.

TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Amendment No. 40—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$425,500 instead of \$422,000 as proposed by the House and \$429,000 as proposed by the Senate.

HAMER H. BUDGE,
BEN F. JENSEN,
JOHN TABER,
CLIFF CLEVINGER,
JOHN E. FOGARTY,
A. M. FERNANDEZ,
CLARENCE CANNON,

Managers on the Part of the House.

NBC COMMENT PROGRAM

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I include the following from the NBC television program Comment, broadcast on Monday, June 28, 1954:

Mr. ROMNEY WHEELER. Right off the bat, let me say that I'm going to be controversial.

You can't tell the truth about the way the British feel and pull punches. You can't explain the fears and misgivings and suspicions that have grown up in London recently, without being blunt. And bluntness—in times like these—is bound to be controversial.

I've just come from London, and I can tell you that when Prime Minister Churchill and Mr. Eden took off for Washington, they not only carried the full confidence of the British people; they actually left as heroes. Heroes because they were standing up to the Americans, and telling them the facts of life.

To an American correspondent, living and working in London, as I do, this is an alarming situation. Because it means that the differences between Britain and America are really deep; and that misgivings and anxiety on both sides are just about as great as it's possible to have without an actual, irrevocable break between the English-speaking powers.

This is not just anti-Americanism. I live and work in Britain, and I find very little of that.

On the other hand, there's a very real concern about what America intends to do; a real fear that Britain and the British Commonwealth may be the tail on a very erratically handled kite that suddenly may wind up in a tree. We, here at home, may think that's absurd, but, nevertheless, it exists.

Before he left London, Anthony Eden told the House of Commons there would be some plain speaking in Washington. He was cheered by both sides of the house, regardless of party politics. And this is why:

No matter what government rules Britain—whether it's Churchill and the Conservatives, or Attlee and the Laborites—British foreign policy is based equally on two foundations:

First, Britain's responsibilities to the Commonwealth and the British Empire. And, second, the Anglo-American alliance.

The British have made it clear—many, many times—that in their view, the peace and security of the world depend on the Anglo-American alliance. And Sir Winston has made it equally clear that, if the chips are down, Britain inevitably would back the United States.

But—and it's a very big but—Britain is not just a small group of islands off the northwest coast of Europe. Britain is the heart of a Commonwealth extending right around the world; and by far the greatest number of those people are Asiatics. So Britain is going to think a long time before doing anything that would hurt or alienate the Commonwealth; exactly as our Government would consider carefully before hurting or alienating Texas or California or the State of Washington.

Well, now, there is the heart of the problem:

On one hand, Churchill is determined to cooperate with the United States; to do everything possible to see that Britain and America present a united front to communism. On the other hand, he and the others who speak for Britain are not at all sure what we're aiming at. I have been asked repeatedly in London: Exactly what is American foreign policy? Does America have a foreign policy, in the true sense of the word? Or is it a combination of what Mr. Dulles may say at his news conference this morning; what Senator KNOWLAND may say to reporters at lunch; what Admiral Radford

may tell the Armed Services Committee this afternoon; and what Senator McCARTHY may say at a public dinner tonight?

To the British—and they will tell you this quite frankly—it all adds up to a howling uncertainty.

That's hardly a helpful situation, between allies. But it doesn't end there. Entirely apart from this general feeling of insecurity, there is a lamentable absence of British confidence in our Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles.

This is not just a recent blowup. It goes back even before Mr. Dulles became Secretary of State.

I remember talking with Herbert Morrison, when he was British Foreign Secretary in the Attlee government. It was when we were negotiating the Japanese Peace Treaty. Morrison told me Dulles had given Britain a firm pledge that the United States would not influence Japan one way or the other about China; that it would be left to the Japanese, themselves, whether they recognized Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist Government or the Communist government at Peiping.

Yet, almost immediately afterward, the Japanese Prime Minister made public the famous Dulles letter, in which Mr. Dulles put pressure on Japan to recognize Chiang Kai-shek.

Now, maybe it was entirely right and desirable for Japan to line up with Nationalist China, and to ignore the Chinese Reds. But the point is: The British felt keenly that Mr. Dulles went back on a solid promise; a promise without which the British Parliament would not have ratified the Japanese treaty, in the first place.

The British also feel that Mr. Dulles has been regrettably short on diplomacy; that he used a bullwhip on the French in trying to force ratification of the European Defense Community; and that he jumped the gun on a southeast Asia defense alliance, without being sure either of French support or the support of the Asian countries concerned.

The British argue, perhaps with a fair degree of logic, that it's absurd to think that Indochina could be saved—and held indefinitely—by white soldiers alone, even if Britain and America had the men available, and were prepared to have them fight in Indochina.

They agree that the Indians, the Burmese, and some of the other Asiatic peoples may be unrealistic about the threat of communism. But they believe that communism will be defeated in Asia only if the Asiatics, themselves, will defend their liberties. And they hope that what's happening in Indochina may be the shock that will jar India and the other Asiatic nations into action.

Mr. Dulles undoubtedly had a good point when he told Mr. Eden that the West would be in a much stronger position at Geneva if it went ahead right now and organized a southeast Asia defense treaty. On the other hand, Mr. Eden argued—perhaps with equal logic—that a defense organization, formed while fighting was going on, almost certainly would be called on to fight, too. And if the United States was not prepared to send ground forces into Indochina, we had better try to stop the war first, by negotiation, before getting involved in defense commitments.

That's what Mr. Churchill meant—over the weekend—when he said it was better to jaw-jaw with the Communists than to war-war.

One thing we must keep in mind. Winston Churchill and Anthony Eden have political problems in Britain quite as difficult as we have in America. They have an election coming, probably next year. And British public opinion is strongly on the side of using the big stick only as a last resort.

You may say that the British—particularly the Socialists are starry-eyed and naive to believe you can do business with the Communists. But a lot of Britons do believe in the possibility of negotiation and compromise.

Mr. MAX FREEDMAN, Washington correspondent for the Manchester Guardian. Mr. Dulles has never been popular with the British press and there's a tendency today to blame him for the present mischief in Asia. That's dangerous folly; as silly and sinister as the attempts by some Members of Congress to degrade Mr. Eden into a creature of appeasement. The issues which divide the two Governments touch some of the most urgent principles of national policy. The real differences concern Asia. So let's concentrate on that point.

Let's begin by clearing away some misconceptions about Indochina. The American Government never seriously considered an air strike at Dien Bien Phu. It rejected this policy on its own responsibility. Britain exercised no veto. In fact London was never consulted. Nor did Great Britain stop America's general military involvement in Indochina. There were strong military reasons raised in Washington against such involvement, and France refused to give the native peoples immediate and unconditional independence. London had nothing to do with Washington's decision.

The only issue on which Great Britain exercised decisive influence was in the discussion of a collective security pact based on Mr. Dulles' principle of united action in Asia. On April 20 Mr. Eden told Mr. Dulles that England, at this stage, could take no part in these negotiations. The British Government gave two main reasons for this decision. The pact should include the five Colombo powers—India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Burma, Indonesia. The pact should not be proclaimed before the conference at Geneva had fully tested Communist intentions. Otherwise China might send troops into Indochina and there would be danger of world war.

Even today the British position is misunderstood. Mr. Eden still thinks the collective security pact should wait until there is some settlement in Indochina. How else will you know what frontiers are to be guaranteed by united action? The British Government also is convinced that no pact can succeed without the support of Indian and the other free nations of Asia. That is why Mr. Eden has proposed two pacts. One would be a mutual pact of non-aggression signed by China and the western powers. The other would be the Pacific equivalent of NATO and would protect the free world against Communist aggression in Asia. If China refused to cooperate she would be made to suffer the coercive power of the free world. It is a flexible but strong policy. It wins us the greatest number of allies in Asia. It will give us the support of the Colombo powers. These countries will not support Mr. Dulles' plan because it is directed against China and treats her as a potential and perpetual aggressor.

Many Americans believe that India is a troublesome critic. We believe that India is a priceless asset. We also feel that American policy would be much wiser if it listened more frequently to Mr. Nehru's advice instead of getting entangled with the ambitions of Chiang Kai-shek, Bao Dal, and Syngman Rhee. American policy in Asia has sometimes been on the wrong side; it has never been on the side of wrong.

In essence the British complaint about American policy is that the American people have dangerously misunderstood the meaning of the Chinese revolution. Many Americans accuse the State Department of having lost China—as if the State Department

owned the title deeds to Chinese freedom and somehow misplaced them. With great respect British officials suggest to their American colleagues that what happened in China is due less to the attitudes of Washington than to the actions of the Chinese people. But this argument is obstinately resisted. China's destiny is treated in the United States not as the high concern of national policy but as the angry theme of political passion. It ceases to be a problem in creative diplomacy and becomes a problem in abnormal psychology. America believes China inevitably must resort to aggression. Britain thinks there is a chance China might like to concentrate on her internal problems. But China's cooperation is very hard to get while this country, as the leader of the free world, refuses to recognize Communist China, threatens to veto her membership in the United Nations, tries to strangle her trade, abuses her world opinion as a nation whose word cannot be trusted, refuses even to talk with China's leaders at the Geneva Conference, and parades the exiled inefficiencies of Chiang Kai-shek as the alternative to the Communist Government. The United States treats China as if she is an outlaw state. Is it really a matter for indignation and surprise if China sometimes behaves like an outlaw?

But we must not endanger the future by quarrelling over the past. Both London and Washington have made concessions. Otherwise the Churchill-Eden mission will prove a barren pilgrimage instead of an adventurous experiment for peace. The Foreign Office must pursue the right policy without being self-righteous; and the State Department must banish its old fear that it is making a bad bargain if it wins peace with China at the cost of war with Congress.

The partnership between England and America will endure. Despite present differences it will grow in freedom. It is the shield and sanctuary of all nations which cherish peace and seek to protect the threatened frontiers of human decency. It cannot fail.

This is Max Freedman.

LEGISLATIVE AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS, 1955 — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BOW submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 9203) making appropriations for the legislative branch and the judiciary branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1997)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9203) making appropriations for the legislative branch and the judiciary branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 48 and 61.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 28, 29, 30, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 41, 49, 50, 51, 53, 57, 58, 59, and 64 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,717,636"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$875,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,332,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$260,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$12,850,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,443,550"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 9, 11, 14, 15, 17, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 31, 32, 36, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, and 63.

FRANK T. BOW,
SAM COON,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
JOHN TABER,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
CLARENCE CANNON.

Managers on the Part of the House.

KARL MUNDT,
STYLES BRIDGES,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
BURNET R. MAYBANK,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9203) making appropriations for the legislative branch and the judiciary branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—LEGISLATIVE BRANCH Senate

Amendments Nos. 1-47: Authorize funds for various Senate and joint activities, as proposed by the Senate, except Amendment No. 22 on which the House managers will propose to appropriate \$120,775.

Amendment No. 48: Strikes out Senate language which proposed extension of the Civil Service Retirement Act to certain non-Federal employees.

Amendment No. 49: Appropriates \$20,000 for the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 50 and 51: Appropriate \$799,900 for subway and office building expenses, as proposed by the Senate.

Library of Congress

Amendment No. 52: Appropriates \$4,717,636 for salaries and expenses instead of \$4,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,935,272 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 53: Appropriates \$1,100,000 for salaries and expenses of the Copy-

right Office as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 54: Appropriates \$875,000 for the Legislative Reference Service instead of \$850,000 as proposed by the House and \$916,079 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 55: Appropriates \$1,332,000 for distribution of catalog cards instead of \$1,250,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,414,037 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 56: Appropriates \$260,000 for general increase of the Library of Congress instead of \$250,000 as proposed by the House and \$270,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE II—THE JUDICIARY

Amendment No. 57: Appropriates \$210,160 for salaries and expenses, Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, as proposed by the Senate instead of \$206,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 58: Appropriates \$495,630 for salaries and expenses, Customs Court, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 59: Appropriates \$5,472,500 for salaries of judges, Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and other Judicial Services, as proposed by the Senate instead of \$5,650,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 60: Appropriates \$12,850,000 for salaries of supporting personnel, instead of \$12,750,000 as proposed by the House and \$12,923,690 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 61: Appropriates \$1,800,000 for travel and miscellaneous expenses, as proposed by the House, instead of \$1,963,705 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 62: Appropriates \$1,443,550 for expenses of referees instead of \$1,400,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,487,100 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 63: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 64: Changes section number in the bill, as proposed by the Senate.

FRANK T. BOW,
SAM COON,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
JOHN TABER,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
CLARENCE CANNON.

Managers on the Part of the House.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1955—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BUDGE submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 9447) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1998)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9447) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 7, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 20, 29, 32, 37, and 39.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 9, 12, 19, and 25 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,327,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ", of which not more than \$85,000 shall be for international labor affairs"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "not to exceed \$50,000 for improving the conditions of migratory labor"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$722,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,705,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$6,116,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$635,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$850,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$21,737,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$14,147,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$16,668,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$8,270,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree

to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$6,180,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$7,600,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$64,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,487,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,112,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "Provided, That, except as may be otherwise provided for herein, not more than \$200,000 of the funds, including trust funds, appropriated by this title may be used at the departmental level under authority of section 601 of the Act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417), as amended, and section 7 of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "\$90,000, of which \$45,000 shall be available only to the National Institutes of Health"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$425,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 18 and 30.

HAMER H. BUDGE,
BEN F. JENSEN,
JOHN TABER,
CLIFF CLEVINGER,
JOHN E. FOGARTY,
A. M. FERNANDEZ,
CLARENCE CANNON,

Managers on the Part of the House.

EDWARD J. THYE,
STYLES BRIDGES,
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
LISTER HILL,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9447) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 1—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$1,327,000 instead of \$1,300,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,354,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2—Salaries and expenses: Restores language proposed by the House limiting amount available for international labor affairs and increases such amount to \$85,000 instead of \$60,000 as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Labor Standards

Amendment No. 3—Salaries and expenses: Provides not to exceed \$50,000 for improving the conditions of migratory labor instead of \$100,000 proposed by the Senate. The managers on the part of the House and Senate are disturbed by the lack of central coordination of the increasing activities in this field by many executive agencies. The managers believe that the expenditure of the same amount of Federal funds would result in a more effective program if these activities were more closely coordinated, and strongly urge that the 1956 budget for the executive branch be prepared with a view to correcting this deficiency.

Amendment No. 4—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$722,500 instead of \$665,000 as proposed by the House and \$780,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Employment Security

Amendment No. 5—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$4,705,000 instead of \$4,650,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,760,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6—Salaries and expenses: Strikes language proposed by the House and inserts language as proposed by the Senate to give the Department discretion in determining the total amount to be set aside for the Veterans' Employment Service.

Amendments Nos. 7 and 8—Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment services administration: Establish a contingency fund of \$16,400,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$6,000,000 as proposed by the Senate and strike language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9—Salaries and expenses, Mexican farm labor program: Appropriates \$1,581,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,521,000 as proposed by the House.

Wage and Hour Division

Amendment No. 10—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$6,116,500 instead of \$6,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$6,233,000 as proposed by the Senate.

General Provisions

Amendment No. 11: Strikes language proposed by the Senate to provide authority to transfer funds between appropriations.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

American Printing House for the Blind

Amendment No. 12—Education of the blind: Appropriates \$205,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$175,000 as proposed by the House.

Food and Drug Administration

Amendment No. 13—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$5,100,000 as proposed

by the House instead of \$5,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of Education

Amendment No. 14—Payments to school districts: Appropriates \$55,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$58,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15—Payments to school districts: Strikes language proposed by the Senate regarding the effective date of the 3-percent absorption feature of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, as amended.

Office of Vocational Rehabilitation

Amendment No. 16—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$635,000 instead of \$620,000 as proposed by the House and \$650,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Public Health Service

Amendment No. 17: Strikes language proposed by the Senate for the purpose of paying expenses for schooling for dependents of personnel stationed abroad under certain circumstances.

Amendment No. 18—Tuberculosis: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 19—Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene: Appropriates \$3,565,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,295,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 20—Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Territory of Alaska: Restores language proposed by the House relating to the marine health units "Health" and "Hygiene."

Amendment No. 21—Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services: Appropriates \$850,000 instead of \$750,000 as proposed by the House and \$950,000 as proposed by the Senate. In acting on this item the managers took into consideration the pending request for a supplemental appropriation of \$200,000 for this activity.

Amendment No. 22—National Cancer Institute: Appropriates \$21,737,000 instead of \$21,237,000 as proposed by the House and \$22,737,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23—Mental health activities: Appropriates \$14,147,500 instead of \$13,460,000 as proposed by the House and \$14,460,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24—National Heart Institute: Appropriates \$16,668,000 instead of \$16,168,000 as proposed by the House and \$17,168,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 25—Dental health activities: Appropriates \$1,990,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,740,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 26—Arthritis and metabolic disease activities: Appropriates \$8,270,000 instead of \$7,270,000 as proposed by the House and \$9,270,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27—Microbiology activities: Appropriates \$6,180,000 instead of \$5,930,000 as proposed by the House and \$6,430,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 28—Neurology and blindness activities: Appropriates \$7,600,500 instead of \$6,913,000 as proposed by the House and \$8,413,000 as proposed by the Senate.

St. Elizabeths Hospital

Amendment No. 29—Major repairs and preservation of buildings and grounds: Strikes out language proposed by the Senate to provide for reimbursement of a portion of these expenses by the executive agencies and the District of Columbia using the facilities of the hospital.

Amendment No. 30—Construction, maximum security building: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur in the language of the Senate which provides \$110,000 for the preparation of tentative drawings for a maximum security building and for reimbursement of a pro rata share of the expenses of future construction by the District of Columbia with an

amendment which would add to the latter provision the expenses of major repairs. In agreeing to this language the managers on the part of the House and the Senate anticipated a consolidation of appropriation items for future years to include under "Construction" all major repairs and to include under "Salaries and expenses" any minor items. The managers therefore desire that the budget for 1956 be prepared in this manner.

Social Security Administration

Amendment No. 31—Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance: Authorizes \$64,400,000 instead of \$64,150,000 as proposed by the House and \$64,650,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32—Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance: Strikes provision of the Senate relating to the position of Director, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance.

Amendment No. 33—Grants to States for public assistance: Appropriates \$1,487,500 instead of \$1,450,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,550,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 34—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$1,112,500 instead of \$1,075,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,150,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 35—Salaries and expenses: Restores, with perfecting language, the provision of the House limiting the transfer of funds for the performance of centralized activities at the departmental level.

Amendment No. 36—Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Services: Appropriates \$1,800,000 instead of \$1,775,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,835,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37—Working capital fund: Strikes language proposed by the Senate relating to the use of this fund for the additional functions of central accounting service and central internal audit service.

General provisions

Amendment No. 38—Section 204: Provides a limitation of \$90,000 on the amount which may be used for expenses of travel to meetings instead of \$75,000 as proposed by the House and \$105,000 as proposed by the Senate and provides that \$45,000 of such limitation shall be available only to the National Institutes of Health as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 39: Strikes language proposed by the Senate to provide authority to transfer funds between appropriations.

TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Amendment No. 40—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$425,500 instead of \$422,000 as proposed by the House and \$429,000 as proposed by the Senate.

HAMER H. BUDGE,
BEN F. JENSEN,
JOHN TABER,
CLIFF CLEVINGER,
JOHN E. FOGARTY,
A. M. FERNANDEZ,
CLARENCE CANNON,

Managers on the Part of the House.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, AND THE UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CLEVINGER submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 8067) making appropriations for the Department of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the United States Information Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2000)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8067) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the United States Information Agency, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 8, 12, 13, 19, 20, 22, 29, 32, 34, 36, 44, 45½, and 48.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 5, 6, 7, 15, 16, 18, 24, 38, and 39, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed by said amendment insert "seven"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$475,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$245,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$310,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$14,700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,472,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 207. None of the funds appropriated by this title may be used in the preparation or prosecution of the suit in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, Southern Division, by the United States of America against Fallbrook Public Utility District, a public service corporation of the State of California, and others: *Provided*, That this section shall have no force and effect after the effective date of H. R. 5731, 83rd Congress, as finally enacted into law."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,050,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Issued July 1, 1954

For actions of June 30, 1954

83rd-2nd, No. 121

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....4	Foreign aid.....3,4	Prices, support....2,11,16
CCC.....13	Insect control.....7	Property.....9
Census.....4	Life insurance.....18	Surplus commodities...1,14
Electrification.....15,17	Personnel.....10,18	Taxation.....6
Farm program.....2	Plant disease.....7	Trade agreements.....8
Flood control.....5,12		

HIGHLIGHTS: Both Houses agreed to conference report on surplus commodities bill. House debated farm program bill. House passed foreign aid bill. House committee approved \$20 million item for USDA flood control. Both Houses agreed to conference reports on Labor-HEW and State, Justice, Commerce appropriation bills. House passed temporary appropriations continuation measure. Senate debated tax revision bill. Sen. Aiken and Rep. Wolcott introduced bills to increase CCC borrowing power.

HOUSE

1. SURPLUS COMMODITIES. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on S. 2475, to provide various methods for disposal of surplus commodities (pp. 8878, 8804). This bill will now be sent to the President.
2. FARM PROGRAM. Began and concluded general debate on H. R. 9680, to provide for continued price support for agricultural products, to augment the marketing and disposal of such products, to provide for greater stability in the products of agriculture, etc. The bill will be read for amendment beginning today. (pp. 8896-946.)
3. FOREIGN AID. Passed, 260-126, with amendments H. R. 9678, to authorize foreign aid appropriations for 1955 (pp. 8878-94). Agreed to an amendment by Rep. Tollefson requiring that at least 50% of the commodities exported under the bill be carried in American-flag vessels (pp. 8879-85).
4. APPROPRIATIONS. Both Houses agreed to conference reports on the following bills and completed congressional action so that they are ready for Presidential action: ~~H. R. 9203, Legislative-Judiciary bill (pp. 8873-4, 8802-3).~~ H. R. 9447, Labor-HEW bill (pp. 8874-5, 8800-1). H. R. 8067, State, Justice, Commerce bill (pp. 8875-8, 8801). The House concurred in the Senate amendments to

-2-

provide \$16,000,000 for a census of agriculture and to provide a position as Assistant Secretary of Commerce in lieu of an Administrative Assistant Secretary (p. 8877).

Passed without amendment H. J. Res. 552, to continue appropriations for foreign aid and various other activities pending enactment of regular appropriations. This measure had been reported by the Appropriations Committee earlier in the day (H. Rept. 2008). (pp. 8949, 8944-5.)

5. FLOOD CONTROL. During consideration of a proposed omnibus flood-control bill, the Public Works Committee approved an authorization item of \$20 million for the work of this Department on watersheds (p. D763).

SENATE

6. TAXATION. Continued debate on H. R. 8300, the general tax revision bill (pp. 8813-65, 8868-9).
7. INSECT AND PLANT-DISEASE CONTROL. Received from this Department a proposed bill to authorize cooperation with Mexico and Canada in the control of incipient or emergency outbreaks of insect pests or plant diseases in those countries; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee (p. 8804).
8. TRADE AGREEMENTS. Received from the Tariff Commission a report on the operation of the trade agreements program; to Finance Committee (p. 8804).
9. PROPERTY. A Government Operations subcommittee voted to recommend to the full committee approval of H. R. 5605, to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act to provide that transfers of real property from certain Government corporations to other Government agencies shall not operate to remove such real property from local tax rolls (p. D760).
10. RETIREMENT. Sen. Morse inserted a National Association of Retired Civil Employees of Eugene, Oreg., resolution favoring H. R. 8894, to provide that annuity increases be placed on a permanent basis (p. 8870).
11. PRICE SUPPORTS. Sen. Morse inserted a Riverview Farmers' Union, Oreg., resolution favoring continuation of rigid price supports (p. 8871).
12. FLOOD CONTROL. Sen. Morse inserted a Coos County, Oreg., Farm Bureau resolution favoring the Coquille River flood-control project as an aid to irrigation and watershed development (p. 8871).

BILLS INTRODUCED

13. COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION. S. 3686, by Sen. Aiken, and H. R. 9756, by Rep. Wolcott, to increase the borrowing authority of CCC by \$1 $\frac{1}{2}$ billion additional; to Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee and House Banking and Currency Committee (pp. 8805, 8949).
14. SURPLUS COMMODITIES. H. R. 9752, by Rep. Knox, to provide supplementary benefits for recipients of public assistance under Social Security Act programs through the issuance of certificates to be used to obtain surplus agricultural commodities; to Agriculture Committee (p. 8949). Remarks of author (pp. A4758-9).
15. ELECTRIFICATION. H. R. 9751, by Rep. Rhodes, Ariz., to authorize Interior to sell certain Parker-Davis transmission facilities; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (p. 8949).



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 83^d CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 100

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 30, 1954

No. 121

Senate

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 22, 1954)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, from whom all blessings flow: Draw very near unto us, we beseech Thee, in this moment of supplication. As we stretch lame hands of prayer to Thee, grant us the benediction of Thy peace. Look with Thy healing mercy upon this fear-haunted world, where so many flowers of hope have faded, so many lamps of faith are flickering low, where so much joy has turned to dust. As we look away from our paltry and passing concerns to the vast arch of Thy spangled heavens, may we know that no momentary eclipse can hide for long the sun of Thy righteous love from whose infinite effulgence there is poured upon us the light that is our life. Even as pilgrims of the night may we follow faithfully the star of truth and justice to a future for all humanity glorified by the light which alone comes from Thee. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 29, 1954, was dispensed with.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR TODAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, before I suggest the absence of a quorum, I should like to invite the minority leader's attention to the procedure desired to be followed today.

As the Members of the Senate know, following the morning hour we shall, under the unanimous-consent agreement, be operating under controlled time. I have been informed that this morning the House of Representatives acted on conference reports on the three appropriation bills which were filed in the House yesterday. So far as I know, there will be no controversy, certainly

no major controversy, with respect to any of the conference reports. I believe I am correct in stating that the reports were signed by all the Senate conferees in each instance, or certainly at least all the conferees who were in the city. I assume the messages from the House will be received in the Senate probably by the time the Senate shall have completed its quorum call.

If it meets with the approval of the Senate, I have in mind requesting that the Senate take up the three conference reports, then proceed to the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches, and then, upon completion of the morning business, proceed to the debate on the tax bill, under controlled time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I shall have no objection to the immediate consideration of the conference reports, if I may have an understanding with the distinguished majority leader that their consideration will be temporarily suspended, if a prolonged controversy over any of the reports develops. As the majority leader well knows, we may begin voting on the tax bill today. I am just as anxious as is the majority leader to expedite action on the conference reports on the appropriation bills. I think the Committee on Appropriations has done an extremely fine job on the appropriation bills this year, the best I have ever seen in the Senate. I think the majority leader's programing of the bills has resulted in dispatch and orderly procedure in which the Senate can take pride.

If the majority leader will give me the assurance that action on the conference reports will be postponed in the event prolonged controversy develops, then I am agreeable to following the course which has been suggested.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would not want any prolonged controversy to be engaged in ahead of action on the tax bill. I think I can give the Senator from Texas assurance that there will not be any lengthy debate on the conference reports.

I wish to express my appreciation of the Senator's remarks, and to pay tribute to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and not only to the majority but to the minority members of the committee and the subcommittees, which did so much to expedite work on the appropriation bills, to the House of Representatives itself, which sent the bills over to the Senate this year in a very expeditious manner, and also to the entire Senate for its cooperation in helping to expedite action on the bills. The Congress is now in a situation which has happened only occasionally in the past quarter of a century; since it will have completed congressional action on all the major departmental appropriation bills prior to the expiration of the fiscal year at midnight tonight, and all the bills should be on the desk of the President before that time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from California may be assured of the continued cooperation of the minority leader, and, with the understanding I have stated, the minority will be glad to have the conference reports taken up. The majority leader has set an example in the way of expediting appropriation bills for which we can all be grateful.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I again wish to express my appreciation to my friend, the minority leader, for the assistance he has rendered in helping to carry out the program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the quorum call, it may be understood that the Senate will take up the conference reports on the appropriation bills, if they have at that time arrived from the House of Representatives, to be followed by the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches, and thereafter, pursuant to the order entered, we shall be operating on divided and controlled time on the tax bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Fulbright	Martin
Anderson	George	Maybank
Barrett	Gillette	McCarran
Beall	Goldwater	McClellan
Bennett	Gore	Millikin
Bowling	Green	Monroney
Bricker	Hayden	Morse
Bridges	Hendrickson	Mundt
Burke	Hennings	Murray
Bush	Hickenlooper	Neely
Butler, Md.	Hill	Pastore
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Payne
Byrd	Humphrey	Potter
Capehart	Ives	Purtell
Carlson	Jackson	Robertson
Case	Jenner	Russell
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Cordon	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Crippa	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Daniel	Kerr	Sparkman
Dirksen	Kilgore	Stennis
Douglas	Knowland	Symington
Duff	Kuchel	Thye
Dworshak	Langer	Upton
Eastland	Lehman	Watkins
Ellender	Lennon	Welker
Ervin	Long	Wiley
Ferguson	Magnuson	Williams
Flanders	Malone	Young
Frear	Mansfield	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SALTONSTALL in the chair). A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8571) to authorize the construction of naval vessels, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ARENDS, Mr. VINSON, and Mr. DEVEREUX were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2475) to authorize the President to use agricultural commodities to improve the foreign relations of the United States, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8067) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the United States Information Agency, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 25, 43, and 47 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 17, 40, and 49 to the bill, and

concurred therein severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9203) making appropriations for the legislative branch and the judiciary branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9, 11, 14, 15, 17, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 31, 32, 36, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, and 63 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22 to the bill, and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9447) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 18 and 30 to the bill, and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9447) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of June 29, 1954, pp. 8742, 8743, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have prepared a statement giving a complete and detailed explanation of what the conferees did relative to the Senate amendments. If it is desired that it be read, I shall be glad to read it. If not I shall ask to have it printed in the RECORD.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I do not desire to have the statement read, but I should like to ask a question. Was the conference report

signed by all the conferees on the part of the Senate?

Mr. THYE. Yes. The conference report was signed by all the conferees, both Senate and House. No conferee refrained from signing the report.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my report on the conference committee's action be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

H. R. 9447, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and for related independent agencies, carried a total of \$1,983,182,761 as it passed the Senate, which was \$12,804,000 over the House allowances, and \$17,897,500 over the 1955 budget estimates.

The conference agreement provides a total of \$1,975,198,261, a decrease of \$7,984,500 under the Senate allowances, but \$4,819,500 over the House allowances, and \$9,913,000 over the budget estimates.

During the consideration of the bill on the Senate floor, there were added five increases, as follows:

1. One hundred thousand dollars for the Bureau of Labor Standards, for the migratory labor problem, offered by Senator COOPER of Kentucky and joined by Senator LEHMAN of New York.

2. One hundred and ten thousand dollars for salaries and expenses for the Bureau of Employment Security, offered by Senator HAYDEN, of Arizona.

3. One hundred and thirty-three thousand dollars for the Wage and Hour Division, offered by Senator PAYNE, of Maine.

4. One hundred thousand dollars for the Food and Drug Administration, offered by Senator NEELY, of West Virginia, for himself and Senator SMATHERS, of Florida.

5. Two hundred and seventy thousand dollars for engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene, of the Public Health Service, offered by Senator BRICKER of Ohio.

Sometimes proponents of amendments accepted on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations to take to conference wonder if the committee isn't agreeing to the amendment merely to expedite floor action, with intention to recede quickly in conference from the Senate amendment. I would like to point out here that on the five amendments agreed to on the Senate floor, the committee of conference took the following action:

Allowed \$50,000 of the \$100,000 Cooper amendment for migratory labor problems.

Allowed \$55,000 of the \$110,000 Hayden amendment for the Bureau of Employment Security.

Allowed \$66,500 of the \$133,000 Payne amendment for the Wage and Hour Division.

Allowed the full \$270,000 Bricker amendment for engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene, Public Health Service.

Allowed nothing of the \$100,000 Neely amendment for the Food and Drug Administration. Here the managers on the part of the House were adamant and just absolutely refused to accede to any part of the Senate increase.

So of the \$713,000 accepted by the committee during floor consideration we were able to retain \$441,500 in conference, or better than 60 percent of such increases.

Of particular interest to a number of Senators was Senate Amendment No. 15, offered by the distinguished chairman of our committee, Senator BRIDGES. The purpose of his amendment was to suspend for 1 year the 3 percent absorption provision added by Public Law 248, 83d Congress. But as drawn the

amendment inadvertently made more liberal provision than the original act, Public Law 874. And so after much discussion the Senate conferees receded, with the understanding though that the House conferees would have a full discussion with members of the House Committee on Education and Labor, and that they would entertain a similar amendment to suspend for 1 year the 3 percent absorption provision, but with no more liberal benefits than obtained under Public Law 874, which required that to qualify for any benefits, a school district must have 3 percent of the average daily attendance in federally affected children.

The Senate conferees as a result of the action taken on amendment No. 15 also receded on Amendment No. 14, by which was added in the Senate \$3,500,000 for the appropriation for payments to school districts as authorized by Public Law 874, as amended by Public Law 248. The action to be taken later on the 3 percent absorption provision will necessitate, of course, a supplemental appropriation, and we will have for consideration then an estimate to pay in full all benefits accruing to the local educational agencies under the law.

The Senate had increased the funds for the sundry items in the National Institutes of Health, amendments 22 to 28, by a total of \$7,750,000. The conference agreement allows one-half of the Senate increase, \$3,875,000, distributed as follows:

To the National Cancer Institute, \$500,000;
To the mental health activities, \$687,500;
To the National Heart Institute, \$500,000;
To the dental health activities, \$250,000,
all of the Senate increase;

To arthritis and metabolic disease activities, \$1 million;

To microbiology activities, \$250,000; and

To neurology and blindness activities, \$687,500.

The Senate conferees hoped to retain the full Senate increases, of course, but some compromise was necessary, and with some reluctance perhaps the House conferees allowed one-half of the Senate increases. I might add however that the amounts agreed to in conference for the National Institutes of Health are \$10,140,000 over the budget estimates, and \$10,115,000 over the 1954 appropriations.

While not a subject to conference, I must remark on the many requests presented to our committee for funds for Grants for the Construction of Research Facilities. Our report to the Senate, Report No. 1623, made brief mention of this, as follows:

"The committee urges the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to investigate this problem to determine the public policy. If such a program is adopted it is the view of this committee that it should be put on a matching basis and the grants be authorized according to formula."

On my own behalf I shall expect the committee staff assigned to this appropriations bill to assist in the preparation of data and the survey of the whole problem in an effort to bring the question before the Senate for a definite conclusion as to whether public moneys should be granted to our colleges and hospitals and other nonprofit institutions to add to the total research facilities in the fight against disease. I hope our study and investigations will offer sufficient evidence to permit us to reach an affirmative conclusion. I personally think that such an expenditure of Federal funds would inure greatly to the public benefit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the

House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 9447, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
June 30, 1954.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 18 to the bill (H. R. 9447) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes," and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: "of which not less than \$4,500,000 shall be available only for grants to States, to be matched by an equal amount of State and local funds expended for the same purpose, for direct expenses of prevention and case-finding projects including salaries, fees, and travel of personnel directly engaged in prevention and case-finding and the necessary equipment and supplies used directly in prevention and case-finding operations, but excluding the purchase of care in hospitals and sanatoria."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 30, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "Construction, maximum security building: For the preparation of tentative drawings for a maximum security building at St. Elizabeths Hospital, \$110,000: *Provided*, That with respect to construction of new facilities hereafter authorized, and expenditures for major repairs of buildings and grounds, the per diem rate calculated for the District of Columbia pursuant to section 2 of the act of August 4, 1947 (24 U. S. C. 168a), shall include a proportionate share of repairs and of the annual increment of the depreciated total cost of such construction, such depreciation to be based on the estimated life thereof, not exceeding 40 years, beginning with the fiscal year following completion of construction, and such proportionate share shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 18 and 30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, AND UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY APPROPRIATIONS — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the 2 Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8067) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the United States Information Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of June 29, 1954, pp. 8744, 8745, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire a question. Did all the conferees on the part of the Senate sign the report?

Mr. BRIDGES. In answer to the question of the distinguished minority leader, let me say that all the Senate conferees except one signed the report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am informed as to the situation with respect to that particular Senator, and I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 8067, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
June 30, 1954.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 25, 43, and 47 to the bill (H. R. 8067) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the United States Information Agency, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "\$62,500,000, and in addition \$200,000 to be derived by transfer from the unobligated balance of the 1954 appropriation, 'Government in Occupied Areas.'"

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "*Provided*, That so long as the position is held by the present incumbent the compensation of the Deputy Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, shall be \$15,000 per annum."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be allocated for expenditures in a particular country except with the approval of the President and a report to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$200,000."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 17, 40, and 49.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

The motion was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE - JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9203) making appropriations for the legislative branch and the judiciary branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of June 29, 1954, p. 8742, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Did all the conferees on the part of the Senate sign the report?

Mr. BRIDGES. All except one member, who was out of town.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if action on this conference report will complete action on the regular appropriation bills for fiscal 1955?

Mr. BRIDGES. When action is taken on this bill it will complete action on all the regular appropriation bills for fiscal 1955. The only appropriation bills remaining to be acted on will be the supplemental appropriation bill, which probably will come up for action toward the latter part of the session, and the foreign-aid appropriation bill, the authorization act which has not been passed by Congress as yet. However, all the regular appropriation bills will have been acted on.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I asked the question because I wished to direct attention to the fact that action on all the regular appropriation bills for fiscal 1955 has been completed on this closing day of the fiscal year 1954. In the 18 years I have been in Congress, in the Senate and in the House, this is one of the few times that has happened—the second time, I believe—in the last decade.

I call attention to that fact because both times when this result has been achieved the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has been the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and the distinguished Member of the House of Representatives, the Honorable JOHN TABER, has been the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House. The two times have been when the Republican Party was in control of the House of Representatives and of the Senate.

The other times, as I recall, was in 1948, when similar prompt action was taken on appropriation bills for the fiscal year 1949. That was in one of the years of the 80th Congress—the much maligned but underrated 80th Congress.

The work of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the work of the distinguished Member of the House of Representatives, the Honorable JOHN TABER, should be noted on this occasion. It is a noteworthy achievement that this year again, for the second time in many years, the fiscal housekeeping of the United States is in order, and Congress is not being called upon to pass continuing resolutions in order that Government agencies may have operating funds for July or August or September. The two Committees on Appropriations and their staffs have done their work well and have completed their work on schedule. The fact should be noted in the RECORD, and I hope that some of the commentators and columnists, who have been talking about the schedule of Congress, will take note of that fact.

And, Mr. President, in the presence of my colleague, the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], who presided over the so-called McCarthy hearings, I should like to point out again that the work of Congress was not interrupted by the work of the Committee on Government Operations or by the work of the special investigating subcommittee of that committee, presided over by my colleague from South Dakota. I take this occasion also to pay my respects to him for the way in which he presided at those hearings. There may have been times when, had it not been for his good nature and his capacity for geniality and his capacity for saying a gentle word, when tempers were inflamed, there might have been an interruption of the work of Congress, certainly an interruption of the work of the committee. The investigating committee kept on with its work and the other committees and the Congress, as a whole, kept on with theirs.

So, while expressing my compliments to the able Senator from New Hampshire as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and to his associates, for keeping the work of Congress on schedule, I also want to compliment my colleague for his work in presiding over the Committee on Investigations. He did a good job. The intensive hearings of his committee did not interfere with the regular work of the Senate.

However, I arose at this time primarily to speak of the work of the Committee on Appropriations, because this is the closing day of the fiscal year, and I commend the committee, its chairman, its members, and its staff for having completed their work on time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from South Dakota will agree that so far as this side of the aisle is concerned there was no delay on the part of any Democrat on the Committee on Appropriations in having the committee do that excellent job.

Mr. CASE. I am happy to have the Senator from Washington add that point. There has certainly been cooperation from both sides of the aisle. The compliments I am extending apply to all members of the Committee on Appropriations who, under the leadership of the Senator from New Hampshire, have done such a fine job.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will say to the Senator from South Dakota that it was only natural for the Democrats on the committee to give such fine cooperation, because most of the appropriations were for continuing the provisions of statutes which the Democratic Congresses had enacted during the past 20 years.

Mr. BRIDGES. Inasmuch as the subject has been brought up, I should like to thank the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for his remarks. I may say also that I wish personally to thank the various members of the Committee on Appropriations, both Republicans and Democrats, who very conscientiously and tirelessly worked on these bills, and did an excellent job. In particular, I wish to thank the chairmen of the various subcommittees who have worked so diligently on their respective appropriation measures.

Secondly, I wish to thank the majority leader and the other Republican Members of the Senate, and the minority leader and all the Democratic Senators, for their cooperation in expediting the passage of the bills.

This year the Eisenhower administration presented the lowest budget request in years. The budget submitted was a good one, the result of months of careful study. But, despite this, the Congress was able to reduce this budget by over \$1,500,000,000. This was an outstanding performance on the part of the Congress in general and the Appropriations Committees in particular. And it was done, in my belief, without impairing a single essential function of government.

Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a summary of the action on appropriation bills. It is a table which shows that the budget estimates submitted were \$44,208,559,415, and that the total appropriations are \$42,668,315,103.

Congress has reduced the budget estimates by \$1,540,244,312. I ask that the summary be printed in the RECORD at this point because it shows the remarkable work that has been done.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House of Representatives

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 30, 1954

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:
Most merciful and gracious God, wilt Thou now kindle within our souls a spirit that is more akin to Thy spirit, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, of sympathy and service.

We humbly confess that we are not wise enough to solve our many difficult problems and to interpret rightly the meaning of the hard and baffling experiences which we are continually encountering.

Show us how we may lay hold of the great eternal resources of spiritual insight and power as we seek to achieve the blessings of freedom and peace for ourselves and all mankind.

Grant that daily we may grow in faith and fidelity and be strengthened with courage to labor and with patience to wait for the time when the souls of men and nations shall be filled with the spirit of love and good will.

In the name of our blessed Lord we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Ast, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 9505. An act to continue the effectiveness of the act of December 2, 1942, as amended, and the act of July 28, 1945, as amended, relating to war-risk hazard and detention benefits until July 1, 1955.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 303. An act to transfer the maintenance and operation of hospital and health facilities for Indians to the Public Health Service, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate amendment No. 1 to the bill (H. R. 9474) entitled "An act to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended."

LEGISLATIVE - JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R.

9203) making appropriations for the legislative branch and the judiciary branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House June 29, 1954.)

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider en bloc those amendments on which the House managers will move to recede and concur, as follows: Nos. 9, 11, 14, 15, 17, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 31, 32, 36, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, and 63.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the amendments, as follows:

Amendment No. 9, page 2, line 17, insert:

"OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

"For clerical assistance to the Vice President, at rates of compensation to be fixed by him in multiples of \$5 per month, \$55,410."

Amendment No. 11, page 2, line 23, insert:

"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"For office of the Secretary, \$444,020: *Provided*, That the basic compensation of the Assistant Parliamentarian shall be increased from \$5,940 to \$7,000, so long as the position is held by the present incumbent."

Amendment No. 14, page 3, line 8, insert:

"For clerical assistance to the conference of the majority, at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman of said committee, \$33,310."

Amendment No. 15, page 3, line 11, insert:

"For clerical assistance to the conference of the minority, at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman of said committee, \$33,310."

Amendment No. 17, page 3, line 18, insert:

"OFFICE OF SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER

"For office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, \$1,276,875, including 7 additional pages at the basic annual rate of compensation of \$1,800 each, as authorized by Public Law 357, 83d Congress; 1 foreman of skilled laborers at \$2,100 basic and 4 skilled laborers at \$1,920 basic each in lieu of 5 skilled laborers at \$1,920 basic each; assistant postmaster at \$4,560 basic in lieu of assistant postmaster at \$4,140 basic; superintendent, service department, at \$4,380 basic in lieu of foreman in folding room at \$3,600 basic; assistant superintendent, service department, at \$2,460 basic in lieu of clerk in folding

room at \$2,460 basic; clerk in service department at \$1,980 basic in lieu of clerk in folding room at \$1,980 basic; chief machine operator at \$2,460 basic in lieu of chief folder at \$2,460 basic; and 13 machine operators at \$1,740 basic each in lieu of 13 folders at \$1,740 basic each: *Provided*, That hereafter the Senate folding room shall be known as the Senate service department."

Amendment No. 23, page 5, line 6, insert:

"Joint Committee on Atomic Energy: For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, including the objects specified in Public Law 20, 80th Congress, \$188,060, and including compensation for stenographic assistance at such rates and in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration notwithstanding the provisions of Public Law 585, 79th Congress."

Amendment No. 24, page 5, line 14, insert:

"Joint Committee on Printing: For salaries for the Joint Committee on Printing at rates to be fixed by the committee, \$39,585; for expenses of compiling, preparing, and indexing the Congressional Directory, \$1,600; for compiling, preparing, and indexing material for the biographical directory, \$1,900, said sum, or any part thereof, in the discretion of the chairman or vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, may be paid as additional compensation to any employee of the United States; and for travel and subsistence expenses at rates provided by law for Senate committees, \$4,500; in all, \$47,585."

Amendment No. 25, page 5, line 25, insert:

"Vice President's automobile: For purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation of an automobile for the Vice President, \$5,835."

Amendment No. 26, page 6, line 3, insert:

"Automobile for the President pro tempore: For purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation of an automobile for the President pro tempore of the Senate, \$5,835."

Amendment No. 27, page 6, line 6, insert:

"Automobiles for majority and minority leaders: For purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation of two automobiles, one for the majority leader of the Senate, and one for the minority leader of the Senate, \$11,670."

Amendment No. 31, page 6, line 19, insert:

"Inquiries and investigations: For expenses of inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate or conducted pursuant to section 134 (a) of Public Law 601, 79th Congress, including compensation for stenographic assistance of committees at such rates and in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration notwithstanding the provisions of section 134 (a) of Public Law 601, 79th Congress; and including \$400,000 for the Committee on Appropriations, to be available also for the purposes mentioned in Senate Resolution No. 193, agreed to October 14, 1943, and Public Law 20, 80th Congress, \$1,224,120; *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for per diem and subsistence expenses (as defined in the Travel Expense Act of 1949) at rates in excess of \$9 per day except that higher rates may be established by the Committee on Rules and Administration in the case of

travel beyond the limits of the continental United States."

Amendment No. 32, page 7, line 12, insert: "Folding documents: For the employment of personnel for folding speeches and pamphlets at a gross rate of not exceeding \$1.50 per hour per person, \$27,000."

Amendment No. 36, page 7, line 24, insert: "Motor vehicles: For maintaining, exchanging, and equipping motor vehicles for carrying the mail, and for official use of the offices of the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, \$9,560."

Amendment No. 40, page 8, line 9, insert: "Airmail and special-delivery stamps: For airmail and special-delivery stamps for Senators and the President of the Senate, as authorized by law, \$19,400, and the maximum allowance per capita of \$132.07 is increased to \$200 for the fiscal year 1955 and thereafter."

Amendment No. 42, page 8, line 17, insert: "Communications: For an amount of communications which may be expended interchangeably for payment, in accordance with such limitations and restrictions as may be prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration, of charges on official telegrams and long-distance telephone calls made by or on behalf of Senators or the President of the Senate, such telephone calls to be in addition to those authorized by the provisions of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947 (60 Stat. 392; 2 U. S. C. 46c, 46d, 46e), the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949 (63 Stat. 77; 2 U. S. C. 46d-1), Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952, Public Law 254, 82d Congress, and Public Law 178, 83d Congress, \$14,550."

Amendment No. 43, page 9, line 6, insert: "The Sergeant at Arms is authorized and directed to secure suitable office space in post office or other Federal buildings in the State of each Senator for the use of such Senator and in the city to be designated by him: *Provided*, That in the event suitable space is not available in such buildings and a Senator leases or rents office space elsewhere, the Sergeant at Arms is authorized to approve for payment, from the contingent fund of the Senate, vouchers covering bona fide statements of rentals due in an amount not exceeding \$900 per annum for each Senator."

Amendment No. 44, page 9, line 16, insert: "The Sergeant at Arms of the Senate is authorized and directed to approve for payment from the contingent fund of the Senate to each Senator an amount not to exceed \$150 quarterly, upon certification of each such Senator, for official office expenses incurred in his State."

Amendment No. 45, page 9, line 21, insert: "Effective July 1, 1954, the paragraph relating to payment of toll charges on official long-distance telephone calls originating and terminating outside of Washington, D. C., under the heading 'Contingent Expenses of the Senate' in Public Law 479, 79th Congress, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"There shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate (1) the toll charges on strictly official long-distance telephone calls originating and terminating outside of Washington, D. C., and (2) the toll charges on strictly official long-distance telephone calls to or from Washington, D. C., in excess of those authorized to be paid under the preceding paragraph, not to exceed \$1,200 per year, for each Senator."

Amendment No. 46, page 10, line 14, insert: "The Secretary of the Senate and the Sergeant at Arms are authorized and directed to protect the funds of their respective offices by purchasing insurance in an amount necessary to protect said funds against loss. Premiums on such insurance shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers approved by the chairman

of the Committee on Rules and Administration."

Amendment No. 47, page 10, line 21, insert: "Salaries or wages paid out of the foregoing items under 'Contingent expenses of the Senate' shall be computed as basic rates, plus increased and additional compensation, as authorized and provided by law."

Amendment No. 63, page 40, line 25, insert: "Sec. 302. The appropriations, authorizations, and authority with respect thereto in this act or any regular annual appropriation act for the fiscal year 1955 which has not been enacted into law prior to July 1, 1954, shall be available from and including such date for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations, authorizations, and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1954, and the date of enactment of this act or the applicable act in anticipation of such appropriations, authorizations, and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the respective terms thereof."

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recede and concur, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Bow moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendments Nos. 9, 11, 14, 15, 17, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 31, 32, 36, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, and 63, and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 22: Page 4, line 24, insert:

"Joint Committee on the Economic Report: For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, \$108,275, including compensation for stenographic assistance at such rates and in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration notwithstanding the provisions of Public Law 304, 79th Congress."

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Bow moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "\$129,775."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

(Mr. BOW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the conference report and the several amendments just agreed to provide total appropriations for the fiscal year 1955 for the legislative and judicial branches of the Government of \$98,197,494. This total is considerably greater than the amounts contained in the bill as it passed the House, however, as is customary, the House did not act on items for the support of the Senate. Although the total increase is \$15,841,549 over the House bill, \$15,485,123 represents items for the direct support of the Senate, joint committees, and services of the Architect of the Capitol on behalf of the Senate. The

items of real increase over the House approved amounts thus total only \$356,426.

With respect to the Library of Congress, various items were agreed to which resulted in an overall increase for the Library of \$434,636 above the House figure. These increases are offset to the extent of \$78,210 in reductions elsewhere in the bill.

Of course, the managers on the part of the House insisted on rejecting in its entirety Senate amendment No. 48, which proposed to place certain non-Federal employees under the Federal retirement system. This proposal would have established a most dangerous precedent by extending retirement benefits to persons not on the Federal payroll who are not contributing to the retirement fund.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 9447) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 29, 1954.)

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 18: Page 20, line 22, insert "of which not less than \$4,500,000 shall be available only for grants to States, to be matched by an equal amount of State and local funds expended for the same purpose, for direct expenses of case-finding projects including salaries, fees, and travel of personnel directly engaged in case finding and the necessary equipment and supplies used directly in prevention and case-finding operations, but excluding the purchase of care in hospitals and sanatoria."

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BUDGE moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert ", of which not less than \$4,500,000 shall be available only for grants to States, to be matched by an equal amount of State and local funds expended for the same purpose, for direct expenses of prevention and case-finding projects including salaries, fees, and travel of personnel directly engaged in prevention and case-finding and the necessary equipment and supplies used directly

in prevention and case-finding operations, but excluding the purchase of care in hospitals and sanatoria."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 30: Page 27, line 15, insert the following:

"Construction, maximum security building: For the preparation of tentative drawings for a maximum security building at St. Elizabeths Hospital, \$110,000: *Provided*, That with respect to construction of new facilities hereafter authorized the per diem rate calculated for the District of Columbia pursuant to section 2 of the act of August 4, 1947 (24 U. S. C. 168a), shall include a proportionate share of the annual increment of the depreciated total cost of such construction, such depreciation to be based on the estimated life, not exceeding 40 years, of such construction, to be determined by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, beginning with the fiscal year following completion of construction, and such proportionate share shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BUDGE moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

"Construction, maximum security building: For the preparation of tentative drawings for a maximum security building at St. Elizabeths Hospital, \$110,000: *Provided*, That with respect to construction of new facilities hereafter authorized, and expenditures for major repairs of buildings and grounds, the per diem rate calculated for the District of Columbia pursuant to section 2 of the act of August 4, 1947 (24 U. S. C. 168a), shall include a proportionate share of repairs and of the annual increment of the depreciated total cost of such construction, such depreciation to be based on the estimated life thereof, not exceeding 40 years, beginning with the fiscal year following completion of construction, and such proportionate share shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, AND THE UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955

Mr. CLEVINGER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 8067) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the United States Information Agency, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 29, 1954.)

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman expect to explain the conference report and the action of the conferees?

Mr. CLEVINGER. Not at the present time.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. CLEVINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, although it seems the majority do not want to talk about it, I feel that the Members of the House and the public should be advised of the action of the conferees with regard to this conference report; but, first, I should like to take this opportunity to say something which was not but should have been said at the time last March when this bill was originally before the House for consideration.

I refer to the faithful and painstaking service to this committee of Mr. Jay B. Howe, executive secretary. He is one of the most capable and trusted members of the top staff of the House Committee on Appropriations. It does not make any difference to Jay which party is in power or who is the chairman. His allegiance and efforts are always for that chairman. And I am in a position to know, because I served for 4 years as chairman of this subcommittee and was a member of it when Jay first came to the Hill. He was loyal and faithful to the late Karl Stefan, of Nebraska, to myself, and to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVINGER]. I see my

friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVINGER], vigorously nodding his head, and I know he agrees with every word I say with regard to Jay Howe. He and I and every member of this committee admire and respect him.

Mr. CLEVINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CLEVINGER. I want to add a word to what the gentleman from New York has said about Mr. Howe. While it rarely occurs to us to be lavish in our praise, I agree heartily with what the gentleman from New York has said about him. He is a fine public servant, wholly selfless in his service to his Government. He has been unfailing in providing the committee the assistance it requires in handling these highly complicated matters. There is no finer, no more able, no more objective man to be found.

Mr. ROONEY. In regard to this pending conference report, Mr. Speaker, when this bill H. R. 8067 passed the House last March 5 it contained appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce and for the United States Information Agency in the total amount of \$1,168,988,000. The other body, upon its consideration of this bill, inserted a number of very extravagantly substantial amendments which increased the total of the bill to \$1,235,021,280. So, your majority conferees are here this morning in full control with a conference report which is \$36,122,500 above the action of the House. This interesting table sets fourth figures which show some of the reasons why the budget isn't going to be balanced this year as they promised:

Department	Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference below estimate
State.....	\$116,191,960	\$108,410,000	¹ \$114,783,280	² \$114,110,000	—\$2,081,960
Justice.....	177,732,000	176,542,000	177,352,000	176,864,500	—867,500
Commerce.....	930,997,000	808,222,000	³ 859,072,000	837,022,000	—93,975,000
U. S. Information Agency.....	89,000,000	75,814,000	⁴ 83,814,000	⁴ 77,114,000	—11,886,000
Total.....	1,313,920,960	1,168,988,000	1,235,021,280	1,205,110,500	—108,810,460

¹ Includes \$1,000,000 reappropriation.

² Includes \$200,000 reappropriation.

³ Includes \$90,000,000 reappropriation.

⁴ Includes transfer of \$3,200,000 reappropriation.

We have added such niceties—and when I say "We," I mean the majority House conferees agreeing with the majority conferees of the other body—as \$200,000 for the Department of State for printing foreign relations volumes, which, I dare say, although allocated and delivered to every Member over the years, have not been read by very many Members of the House.

They have increased the diplomatic representation allowance from \$450,000 to \$475,000. A few years ago, when they were in the minority, they were going to wipe it out completely.

Although, when this bill passed the House, it contained a very ample \$9 million for the international educational exchange program, we now find that that very substantial sum has been increased to \$14.7 million.

You will find that in regard to the legally required census of agriculture, for a sample census of which the committee and House turned down wholly a request in the amount of \$3.5 million when this bill was originally before us for consideration, there is now inserted in the bill \$16 million. You will remember I predicted that. I predicted it when you thought you were saving \$3.5 million at the time this bill was before the House and I said that a full census of agriculture would be inserted. Now we have a real good one; a \$16 million one.

In regard to the Civil Aeronautics Administration item and others, we find that the majority conferees do not seem to have much confidence in the Republican executive department, because they insist in this bill on giving them substantial sums of the taxpayers' money that they do not want, that they did not

ask for, and which they frankly said they did not need.

In regard to the Patent Office in the Department of Commerce, the Commissioner of Patents and President Eisenhower's Bureau of the Budget and the Secretary of Commerce said they could run a better Patent Office this coming year than ever has been run before, for \$11 million. You appropriated every nickel of it when you had this bill. So, what did our friends on the conference do? They added \$1 million to the appropriation for the Patent Office, making it \$12 million. Of course, it is only a million dollars of John Q. Public's money and maybe they will balance the budget next year; who knows? You would not think so from the following colloquy with Commissioner of Patents Watson, at page 126 of the regular printed hearings on appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce for 1955:

Mr. ROONEY. In your proposed plan which you described with a chart a while ago—a copy of which I have in my hand—you would expect that by 1956 fiscal year you would have an annual appropriation for the Patent Office of almost \$15 million; to wit, \$14,700,000. This would compare, would it not, with an appropriation of \$11,500,000 for the fiscal year 1951? Correct?

Mr. WATSON. Yes.

Who said they were going to cut Government spending?

They have created an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce in this bill. They have increased the cost of the Voice of America by \$1,300,000.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Let me say that with regard to some of the 51 items I was in complete agreement. But I think the public is entitled to know all about this and have all the cards placed on the table. These expenditures of taxpayers' money should be explained to the House. If you are really going to try to balance the budget this year, as you said, and you get the opportunity to vote in a conference with the Senate, you do not proceed toward that goal by adding \$36,122,500 in public funds to a bill such as this. This is your responsibility; you have the votes and the control if you want to use them.

With the bill increased by over \$36 million you will find that the conferees have not appropriated the necessary funds to operate the American merchant marine. The conferees did increase the funds for operating-differential subsidies by 10 million but denied 15 million. That 15 million is no saving at all. The request of President Eisenhower and the Bureau of the Budget and the Secretary of Commerce was in the amount of \$80 million for these subsidies to operate our merchant marine and enable it to compete with foreign shipping. The amount has now been compromised in the sum of \$65 million. I repeat, that is no saving at all because under the law these subsidy payments for years gone by must be paid and will be paid.

I do not mean to say that my colleagues from the majority side of the House did not do the best they could on every item, and under all the circumstances, political and otherwise; the great pressures, and so forth. You should know that they tried to save some money, and I should tell you that they tried to save some money; some money such as these operating subsidies for the American merchant marine which by law have to be paid anyhow, and which are going to be paid.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As I understand the statement of the gentleman, it is that they have added to this bill, and the gentleman says that as to some of those additions he agrees. Still the gentleman complains as to the overall picture. Now, what can I do or what can other Members of the House do to make it better? I am willing to vote "No" if the gentleman will explain what can be done.

Mr. ROONEY. The very able gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] well

knows that he can offer a motion to recommit this conference report with instructions to the conferees to insist on the House version of some of the items I have mentioned.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will the gentleman offer such a motion? I will vote for it, if the gentleman will make it.

Mr. ROONEY. I do not intend to do so. The Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce run out of money at midnight tonight.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks).

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, this bill as agreed upon by the conferees appropriates, \$1,201,910,500 for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the United States Information Agency for fiscal year 1955. This is a reduction of \$112,010,460 below the budget estimate, and is \$210,307,101 below the appropriation for the present fiscal year for these departments. The following table sets forth the action in regard to this bill:

Department	Estimate	As passed the House	As passed the Senate	Conference	Conference below estimate
State.....	\$116,191,960	\$108,410,000	¹ \$114,783,280	² \$114,110,000	—\$2,081,960
Justice.....	177,732,000	176,542,000	177,352,000	176,864,500	—867,500
Commerce.....	930,997,000	808,222,000	³ 859,072,000	837,022,000	—93,975,000
U. S. Information Agency.....	89,000,000	75,814,000	⁴ 80,614,000	⁴ 73,914,000	—15,086,000
Total.....	1,313,920,960	1,168,988,000	1,231,821,280	1,201,910,500	—112,010,460

¹ Includes \$1,000,000 reappropriation.

² Includes \$200,000 reappropriation.

³ Includes \$90,000,000 reappropriation.

⁴ Plus transfer of \$3,200,000.

As in most conference agreements, some of the items are not exactly as everyone would like. However, the differences of the two Houses must be settled and a compromise arrived at. The bill before you is approximately \$30 million lower than it was when it passed the Senate. The 2 largest increases over the bill as it originally passed the House are \$16 million for a Census of Agriculture and \$10 million more for operating-differential subsidies.

Mention has been made of the fact that \$25,000 was added over the House allowance for the item "Representation." It should be pointed out, however, that the amount finally agreed upon is \$25,000 below the recommendation of the Senate and, furthermore, the amount finally agreed upon is less than that which has been appropriated for this item for any year since 1945.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 1: Page 4, line 6, insert "\$62,027,280, and in addition \$1,000,000 to be derived by transfer from the unobligated balance of the 1954 appropriation, 'Government in Occupied Areas.'"

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur

in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CLEVENGER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "\$62,500,000, and in addition \$200,000 to be derived by transfer from the unobligated balance of the 1954 appropriation, 'Government in Occupied Areas.'"

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 17: Page 22, line 9, insert ": Provided, That hereafter the compensation of the Deputy Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, shall be \$15,000 per annum."

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CLEVENGER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert ": Provided, That so long as the position is held by the present incumbent the compensation of the Deputy Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, shall be \$15,000 per annum."

The motion was agreed to.

Public Law 472 - 83d Congress
Chapter 457 - 2d Session
H. R. 9447

AN ACT

All 68 Stat. 434.

Making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, namely:

Departments of
Labor, and
Health, Educa-
tion, and Wel-
fare Appropria-
tion Act, 1955.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Department of
Labor Appropria-
tion Act, 1955.

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Secretary of Labor (hereafter in this title referred to as the Secretary), including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); teletype news service; and payment in advance when authorized by the Secretary for dues or fees for library membership in organizations whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public; \$1,327,000, of which not more than \$85,000 shall be for international labor affairs.

60 Stat. 810.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Solicitor, \$1,450,000.

BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the promotion of industrial safety, employment stabilization, and amicable industrial relations for labor and industry; performance of safety functions of the Secretary under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (5 U. S. C. 784 (c)); performance of the functions vested in the Secretary by title I of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 159 (f) and (g)); not to exceed \$50,000 for improving the conditions of migratory labor; and not less than \$75,000 for the work of the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, as authorized by the Act of July 11, 1949 (63 Stat. 409) and provided further that no part of the appropriation for the President's Committee shall be subject to reduction or transfer to any other department or agency under the provisions of any existing law; including purchase of reports and of material for informational exhibits and expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at conferences concerned with the work of the Bureau of Labor Standards; \$722,500.

63 Stat. 865.

61 Stat. 136.

BUREAU OF VETERANS' REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to render assistance in connection with the exercise of reemployment rights under section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 308), the Service Extension Act of 1941, as amended, the Army Reserve and Retired Personnel Service Law of 1940, as amended, and section 9 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and, under the Act of June 23, 1943, as amended (50

54 Stat. 890.

55 Stat. 626.

50 USC app. 351.

54 Stat. 858.

50 USC app. 401.

62 Stat. 614;

65 Stat. 86.

50 USC app. 459.

57 Stat. 162. U. S. C. App. 1472), of persons who have performed service in the Merchant Marine, \$300,000.

BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP

50 Stat. 664. Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to conduct a program of encouraging apprentice training as authorized by the Act of August 16, 1937 (29 U. S. C. 50), \$3,100,000.

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

60 Stat. 810. Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the general administration of the employment service and unemployment compensation programs, including temporary employment of persons, without regard to the civil-service laws, for the farm placement migratory labor program; and not to exceed \$10,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); \$4,705,000, of which \$1,100,000 may be for carrying into effect the provisions of title IV (except section 602) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

58 Stat. 293. Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment
38 USC 695- service administration: For grants in accordance with the provisions
695f. of the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended (29 U. S. C. 49-49n), for carrying into effect section 602 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, for grants to the States as authorized in title III of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 501-503), including, upon the request of any State, the purchase of equipment, and the payment of rental for space made available to such State in lieu of grants for such purpose, for necessary expenses in connection with the operation of employment office facilities and services in the District of Columbia, and for expenses not otherwise provided for, necessary for carrying out title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 684), \$216,400,000, of which \$16,400,000 shall be available only to the extent that the Secretary finds necessary to meet increased costs of administration resulting from changes in a State law or increases in the numbers of claims filed and claims paid over those upon which the State's basic grant (or the allocation for the District of Columbia) was based, which increased costs of administration cannot be provided for by normal budgetary adjustments: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any provision to the contrary in section 302 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended, the Secretary of Labor shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State found to be in compliance with the requirements of the Act of June 6, 1933, and, except in the case of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, with the provisions of section 303 of the Social Security Act, as amended, such amounts as he determines to be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of its unemployment compensation law and of its public employment offices: *Provided further*, That such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Department of Labor and the Post Office Department shall be used for the payment, in such manner as said parties may jointly determine, of postage for the transmission of official mail matter in connection with the administration of unemployment compensation systems and employment services by States receiving grants herefrom.

48 Stat. 113. 38 USC 695b. 49 Stat. 626.

38 USC 991-999.

42 USC 502. 42 USC 503.

In carrying out the provisions of said Act of June 6, 1933, the provisions of section 303 (a) (1) of the Social Security Act, as amended, relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, shall apply.

None of the funds appropriated by this title to the Bureau of Employment Security for grants-in-aid of State agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of operation of said agencies including

the salaries and expenses of officers and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld from the said agencies of any States which have established by legislative enactment and have in operation a merit system and classification and compensation plan covering the selection, tenure in office, and compensation of their employees, because of any disapproval of their personnel or the manner of their selection by the agencies of the said States, or the rates of pay of said officers or employees.

Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to States under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended, and under the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended, for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures made thereunder for payments under such title and under such Act of June 6, 1933, to be charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year.

49 Stat. 626.
42 USC 501-503.
48 USC 113.
29 USC 49-49n.

Unemployment compensation for veterans: For payments to unemployed veterans as authorized by title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, \$55,600,000.

66 Stat. 684.
38 USC 991-999.

Unemployment compensation for veterans, next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to States, as authorized by title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, such sums as may be necessary to pay benefits for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year, and the obligations and expenditures thereunder shall be charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year.

Salaries and expenses, Mexican farm labor program: For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to carry out the functions of the Department of Labor under the Act of July 12, 1951 (Public Law 78), as amended, including temporary employment of persons without regard to the civil service laws, \$1,581,000.

65 Stat. 119.
7 USC 1461-1468.

BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION

Salaries and expenses: For necessary administrative expenses and not to exceed \$112,000 for the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board, \$2,030,000, together with not to exceed \$90,000 to be derived from the War Claims Fund created by section 13 (a) of the War Claims Act of 1948 (50 U. S. C. 2012).

62 Stat. 1247.
50 USC app.
2012.

Employees' compensation fund: For the payment of compensation and other benefits and expenses (except administrative expenses) authorized by law and accruing during the current or any prior fiscal year, including payments to other Federal agencies for medical and hospital services pursuant to agreement approved by the Bureau of Employees' Compensation; continuation of payment of benefits as provided for under the head "Civilian War Benefits" in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1947; the advancement of costs for enforcement of recoveries in third-party cases; the furnishing of medical and hospital services and supplies, treatment, and funeral and burial expenses, including transportation and other expenses incidental to such services, treatment, and burial, for such enrollees of the Civilian Conservation Corps as were certified by the Director of such Corps as receiving hospital services and treatment at Government expense on June 30, 1943, and who are not otherwise entitled thereto as civilian employees of the United States, and the limitations and authority of the Act of September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U. S. C. 796), shall apply in providing such services, treatment, and expenses in such cases; such amount as may be required during the current fiscal year: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for payments

60 Stat. 696.

39 Stat. 742.

All 68 Stat. 437.

50 USC app. 2003,
2004.

pursuant to sections 4 (c) and 5 (f) of the War Claims Act of 1948 (50 U. S. C. 2012) and shall be credited with advances or reimbursements therefor from the War Claims Fund created by section 13 (a) of said War Claims Act of 1948.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

60 Stat. 810.

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the work of the Bureau, including advances or reimbursement to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for services rendered, and not to exceed \$15,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$5,350,000.

WOMEN'S BUREAU

41 Stat. 987.

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the work of the Women's Bureau, as authorized by the Act of June 5, 1920 (29 U. S. C. 11-16), including purchase of reports and material for informational exhibits, \$348,000.

WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

52 Stat. 1060,
29 USC 201.

49 Stat. 2036.

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for performing the duties imposed by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, and the Act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, approved June 30, 1936, as amended (41 U. S. C. 35-45), including reimbursement to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for inspection services rendered, and not to exceed \$3,000 for expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at conferences concerned with the work of the Division, \$6,116,500.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

60 Stat. 810.

Citation of
title.

Department of
Health, Educa-
tion, and Wel-
fare Appropria-
tion Act, 1955.

SEC. 102. Appropriations under this title available for salaries and expenses shall be available for stenographic reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the function or activity for which any such appropriation is made.

This title may be cited as the "Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1955".

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

41 Stat. 272.

Education of the blind: For carrying out the Act of August 4, 1919, as amended (20 U. S. C. 101), \$205,000.

COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF

31 Stat. 844.

Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of Columbia Institution for the Deaf, including personal services and miscellaneous expenses, and repairs and improvements, \$410,000: *Provided*, That the Columbia Institution for the Deaf shall be paid by the District of Columbia, in advance at the beginning of each quarter, at the rate of \$1,295 per school year for each student attending said Institution pursuant to the Act of March 1, 1901 (31 D. C. Code 1008).

Construction: For the construction of a library-class room building at the Columbia Institution for the Deaf \$240,000, to remain available until expended; and for alterations, \$19,000; in all, \$259,000.

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses for carrying out the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 301-392); the Tea Importation Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 41-50); the Import Milk Act (21 U. S. C. 141-149); the Federal Caustic Poison Act (15 U. S. C. 401-411); and the Filled Milk Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 61-64); reporting and illustrating the results of investigations; purchase of chemicals, apparatus, and scientific equipment; not to exceed \$2,000 for payment in advance for special tests and analyses by contract; and payment of fees, travel, and per diem in connection with studies of new developments pertinent to food and drug enforcement operations; \$5,100,000.

52 Stat. 1040;
29 Stat. 604;
44 Stat. 1101,
1406; 42 Stat.
1486.

Salaries and expenses, certification and inspection services: For expenses necessary for the certification or inspection of certain products in accordance with sections 406, 504, 506, 507, 604, 702A, and 706 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 346, 354, 356, 357, 364, 372a, and 376), the aggregate of the advance deposits during the current fiscal year to cover payment of fees by applicants for certification or inspection of such products, to remain available until expended. The total amount herein appropriated shall be available for personal services; purchase of chemicals, apparatus, and scientific equipment; and the refund of advance deposits for which no service has been rendered.

52 Stat. 1049;
55 Stat. 851;
59 Stat. 463.

FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for operation and maintenance, including repairs; furnishing, repairing, and cleaning of wearing apparel used by employees in the performance of their official duties; transfer of funds to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Howard University" for salaries of technical and professional personnel detailed to the hospital; payments to the appropriation of Howard University for actual cost of heat, light, and power furnished by such university; \$2,880,000: *Provided*, That no intern or resident physician receiving compensation from this appropriation on a full-time basis shall receive compensation in the form of wages or salary from any other appropriation in this title: *Provided further*, That the District of Columbia shall pay by check to Freedmen's Hospital, upon the Surgeon General's request, in advance at the beginning of each quarter, such amount as the Surgeon General calculates will be earned on the basis of rates approved by the Bureau of the Budget for the care of patients certified by the District of Columbia. Bills rendered by the Surgeon General on the basis of such calculations shall not be subject to audit or certification in advance of payment; but proper adjustment of amounts which have been paid in advance on the basis of such calculations shall be made at the end of each quarter: *Provided further*, That the Surgeon General may delegate the responsibilities imposed upon him by the foregoing proviso.

Salary restric-
tion.
Payment by
District of
Columbia.

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of Howard University, including personal services and miscellaneous expenses and repairs to buildings and grounds, \$2,720,000.

Construction of buildings: For the construction and equipment of buildings and facilities, under the supervision of the General Services Administration, on the grounds of Howard University, including engineering and architectural services and travel, to remain available until expended, as follows:

For a preclinical medical building, together with alterations and installations in connection with such construction, \$4,436,000.

For a power substation, together with necessary alterations within the power plant, \$272,000.

For repairs to the power plant, \$100,000.

Construction of buildings (liquidation of contract authorization): For payment of obligations incurred under authority previously provided, to enter into contracts for the construction of the following Biology-greenhouse building, \$250,000; law building, \$200,000; and administration building, \$700,000.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Promotion and further development of vocational education: For carrying out the provisions of section 3 of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20 U. S. C. 15), section 4 of the Act of March 10, 1924 (20 U. S. C. 29), section 1 of the Act of March 3, 1931 (20 U. S. C. 30), and the Act of March 18, 1950 (Public Law 462), \$23,673,261: *Provided*, That the apportionment to the States under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 shall be computed on the basis of not to exceed \$23,498,261 for the current fiscal year: *Provided further*, That not more than \$900,000 of this appropriation shall be available for vocational education in distributive occupations.

Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts: For carrying out the provisions of section 22 of the Act of June 29, 1935, as amended, \$2,501,500.

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Office of Education, including surveys, studies, investigations, and reports regarding libraries; fostering coordination of public and school library service; coordination of library service on the national level with other forms of adult education; developing library participation in Federal projects; fostering Nation-wide coordination of research materials among libraries, interstate library coordination and the development of library service throughout the country; purchase, distribution, and exchange of educational documents, motion-picture films, and lantern slides; collection, exchange, and cataloging of educational apparatus and appliances, articles of school furniture and models of school buildings illustrative of foreign and domestic systems and methods of education, and repairing the same; \$2,900,000, of which not less than \$480,000 shall be available for the Division of Vocational Education as authorized: *Provided*, That all receipts from non-Federal agencies representing reimbursement for expenses of travel of employees of the Office of Education performing advisory functions to the said agencies shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of this appropriation.

Payments to school districts: For payments to local educational agencies for the maintenance and operation of schools as authorized by the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874), as amended, \$55,000,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall also be available for carrying out the provisions of section 6 of such Act.

Assistance for school construction: For an additional amount for providing school facilities and for grants to local educational agencies in federally affected areas, as authorized by titles III and IV of the Act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815), as amended, including not to exceed \$575,000 for necessary expenses of technical services rendered by other agencies, \$70,000,000, to remain available until expended, and of which \$12,000,000 shall be available for carrying out title IV of said Act: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for salaries or other direct expenses of the Depart-

60 Stat. 775.
20 USC 15j.
43 Stat. 18;
46 Stat. 1489.
64 Stat. 27.
20 USC 31-33.

49 Stat. 439.
7 USC 329.

64 Stat. 1100.
20 USC 236-244.

67 Stat. 522.
20 USC 291-311.

ment of Health, Education, and Welfare: *Provided further*, That the sum of \$125,000 made available for "technical services rendered by other agencies" under this head in Public Law 357, 83d Congress, Ante, p. 87, shall remain available through June 30, 1955.

OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico): For payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico) in accordance with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended (29 U. S. C., ch. 4) including payments, in accordance with regulations of the Secretary, for one-half of necessary expenditures for the acquisition of vending stands or other equipment in accordance with section 3 (a) (3) (C) of said Act for the use of blind persons, such stands or other equipment to be controlled by the State agency, \$23,000,000, of which not to exceed \$195,000 shall be available to the Secretary for providing rehabilitation services to disabled residents of the District of Columbia, as authorized by section 6 of said Act, which latter amount shall be available for administrative expenses in connection with providing such services in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That not to exceed 15 per centum of the appropriation shall be used for administrative purposes: *Provided further*, That the funds herein appropriated shall be made available to the States in accordance with the provisions of section 3 (a) of Public Law 113 (Seventy-eighth Congress) approved July 6, 1943.

57 Stat. 374.

29 USC 33.

29 USC 36.

57 Stat. 380.

29 USC 31 note.

Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico), next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after May 31, of the current fiscal year, payments to States in accordance with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended (including the objects specified in the preceding paragraph), for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year such sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures made thereunder to be charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year: *Provided*, That the payments made pursuant to this paragraph shall not exceed the amount paid to the States for the first quarter of the current fiscal year.

29 USC 41.

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended, and of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (20 U. S. C., ch. 6A), including not to exceed \$3,000 for production, purchase, and distribution of educational films; \$635,000.

29 USC 41.

49 Stat. 1559.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

For necessary expenses in carrying out the Public Health Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 6A) (hereinafter referred to as the Act), and other Acts, including expenses for active commissioned officers in the Reserve Corps and for not to exceed one thousand five hundred commissioned officers in the Regular Corps, as follows:

58 Stat. 682.

Assistance to States, general: To carry out the purposes, not otherwise specifically provided for, of section 314 (c) of the Act; to provide consultative services to States pursuant to section 311 of the Act; to make field investigations and demonstrations pursuant to section 301 of the Act; to provide for collecting and compiling mortality, morbidity, and vital statistics; and not to exceed \$1,000 for entertainment of officials of other countries when specifically authorized by the Surgeon General; \$13,000,000, of which not more than \$2,400,000 shall be available for personal services.

42 USC 246, 243, 241.

Venereal diseases: To carry out the purposes of sections 314 (a) and 363 of the Act with respect to venereal diseases including the operation and maintenance of centers for the diagnosis and treatment of persons

42 USC 246, 266.

All 68 Stat. 441.

afflicted with venereal diseases; and for grants of money, services, supplies, equipment, and use of facilities to States, as defined in the Act, and with the approval of the respective State health authorities, to counties, health districts, and other political subdivisions of the States, for the foregoing purposes, in such amounts and upon such terms and conditions as the Surgeon General may determine; \$3,000,000.

42 USC 246. Tuberculosis: To carry out the purposes of section 314 (b) of the Act, \$6,000,000, of which not less than \$4,500,000 shall be available only for grants to States, to be matched by an equal amount of State and local funds expended for the same purpose, for direct expenses of prevention and case-finding projects including salaries, fees, and travel of personnel directly engaged in prevention and case-finding and the necessary equipment and supplies used directly in prevention and case-finding operations, but excluding the purchase of care in hospitals and sanatoria.

42 USC 241, 243, 264. Communicable diseases: To carry out, except as otherwise provided for, those provisions of sections 301, 311, and 361 of the Act relating to the prevention and suppression of communicable and preventable diseases, and the interstate transmission and spread thereof, including the purchase, erection, and maintenance of portable buildings; and hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; \$4,300,000.

42 USC 241, 243, 246, 264. Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene: For expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary to carry out those provisions of sections 301, 311, 314 (c), and 361 of the Act relating to sanitation and other aspects of environmental health, including enforcement of applicable quarantine laws and interstate quarantine regulations, and for carrying out the purposes of the Water Pollution Control Act (33 U. S. C. 466-466 (j)); \$3,565,000, of which not less than \$270,000 shall be available only for completing construction of the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center, Cincinnati, Ohio.

42 USC 241, 243, 246, 264, 266. Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Territory of Alaska: To enable the Surgeon General to conduct, in the Service, and to cooperate with and assist the Territory of Alaska in the conduct of, activities necessary in the investigation, prevention, treatment, and control of diseases, and the establishment and maintenance of health and sanitation services pursuant to and for the purposes specified in sections 301, 311, 314 (without regard to the provisions of subsections (d), (f), (h), and (j) and the limitations set forth in subsection (c) of such section), 361 and 363 of the Act, including the hire, operation, and maintenance of aircraft, and the purchase, erection, and maintenance of portable buildings, \$1,125,000, of which not less than \$160,000 shall be available only for the activation and operation of the two immobilized marine health units "Health" and "Hygiene".

60 Stat. 1042. 42 USC 291d-291h. Grants for hospital construction: For payments for hospital construction under part C, title VI, of the Act, as amended, to remain available until expended, \$75,000,000: *Provided*, That allotments under such part C to the several States for the current fiscal year shall be made on the basis of an amount equal to the appropriation granted herein.

Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services: For salaries and expenses incident to carrying out title VI of the Act, as amended, \$850,000.

60 Stat. 903. 42 USC 248, 249, 251, 253, 255-257, 259, 260, 220, 222, 249 note; 33 USC 763c. 3 CFR, 1943 Cum. Supp., p. 1101. Hospitals and medical care: For carrying out the functions of the Public Health Service under the Act of August 8, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 150), and under sections 321, 322, 324, 326, 331, 332, 341, 343, 344, 502, 504, and 710 of the Public Health Service Act, and Executive Order 9079 of February 26, 1942, including purchase and exchange of farm products and livestock; conducting research on technical nursing standards and furnishing consultative nursing services; and purchase of firearms

and ammunition; \$33,000,000, of which \$1,000,000 shall be exclusively available for payments to the Territory of Hawaii for care and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy: *Provided*, That when the Public Health Service establishes or operates a health service program for any department or agency, payment for the estimated cost shall be made in advance for deposit to the credit of this appropriation.

Foreign quarantine service: For carrying out the purposes of sections 361 to 369 of the Act, relating to preventing the introduction of communicable diseases from foreign countries, the medical examination of aliens in accordance with section 325 of the Act, and the care and treatment of quarantine detainees pursuant to section 322 (e) of the Act in private or other public hospitals when facilities of the Public Health Service are not available, including insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when required by law of such countries; \$2,900,000. 42 USC 264-272. 42 USC 252. 42 USC 249.

National Institutes of Health, operating expenses: For the activities of the National Institutes of Health, not otherwise provided for, including research fellowships and grants for research projects pursuant to section 301 of the Act; not to exceed \$1,000 for entertainment of visiting scientists when specifically approved by the Surgeon General; erection of temporary structures; and grants of therapeutic and chemical substances for demonstrations and research; \$4,675,000: *Provided*, That the Surgeon General is authorized to advance to this appropriation from other appropriations to the Public Health Service such amounts as are determined to be necessary for the foregoing purposes and for activities performed on a centralized basis: *Provided further*, That the Surgeon General is authorized to operate facilities at the National Institutes of Health for the sale of meals to employees and others at rates determined by him to be sufficient to recover the cost of such operation and the proceeds thereof shall be credited to this appropriation. 42 USC 241.

National Cancer Institute: To enable the Surgeon General, upon the recommendations of the National Advisory Cancer Council, to make grants-in-aid for research and training projects relating to cancer; to cooperate with State health agencies, and other public and private nonprofit institutions, in the prevention, control, and eradication of cancer by providing consultative services, demonstrations, and grants-in-aid; and to otherwise carry out the provisions of title IV, part A, of the Act; \$21,737,000. 42 USC 281-286.

Mental health activities: For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 311, 312, and 314 (c) of the Act with respect to mental diseases, \$14,147,500. 42 USC 241-244, 246.

National Heart Institute: For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the National Heart Act, \$16,668,000. 62 Stat. 464.

Dental health activities: For expenses not otherwise provided for, necessary to enable the Surgeon General to carry out the purposes of the Act with respect to dental diseases and conditions, \$1,990,000. 42 USC 287 note.

Arthritis and metabolic disease activities: For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act relating to arthritis, rheumatism, and metabolic diseases, \$8,270,000.

Microbiology activities: For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act relating to microbiology, including the regulation and preparation of biologic products, \$6,180,000.

Neurology and blindness activities: For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act relating to neurology and blindness, \$7,600,500.

Gorgas Memorial Laboratory: For payment to the Gorgas Memorial Institute for maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, \$131,000.

67 Stat. 501.

37 USC 371 note.

Retired pay of commissioned officers: For retired pay of commissioned officers, as authorized by law, and payments under the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of 1953, \$1,141,000.

Salaries and expenses: For the divisions and offices of the Office of the Surgeon General and for miscellaneous expenses of the Public Health Service not appropriated for elsewhere, including preparing information, articles, and publications related to public health; and conducting studies and demonstrations in public health methods; \$2,780,000.

Administrative provisions: During the current fiscal year, and with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, there may be transferred from any annual appropriation to the Public Health Service to any other such appropriation such additional amounts as may be required for pay and allowances of the active commissioned officers herein authorized, but any amounts so transferred shall not exceed 5 per centum of any such appropriation and no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 5 per centum as a result of any such transfers.

SAINT ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of the hospital, including purchase of clothing for patients and cooperation with organizations or individuals in the scientific research into the nature, causes, prevention and treatment of mental illness, \$2,445,000.

Major repairs and preservation of buildings and grounds: For miscellaneous construction, alterations, repairs, and equipment, on the grounds of the hospital, including preparation of plans and specifications, advertising, and supervision of construction, \$709,000: *Provided*, That any part of this amount may be transferred to the General Services Administration.

61 Stat. 751.

Construction, maximum security building: For the preparation of tentative drawings for a maximum security building at Saint Elizabeths Hospital, \$110,000: *Provided*, That with respect to construction of new facilities hereafter authorized, and expenditures for major repairs of buildings and grounds, the per diem rate calculated for the District of Columbia pursuant to section 2 of the Act of August 4, 1947 (24 U. S. C. 168a), shall include a proportionate share of repairs and of the annual increment of the depreciated total cost of such construction, such depreciation to be based on the estimated life thereof, not exceeding forty years, beginning with the fiscal year following completion of construction, and such proportionate share shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance: For necessary expenses, including furnishing, repairing, and cleaning of wearing apparel and equipment used by building guards; not more than \$64,400,000 may be expended from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

49 Stat. 620;

64 Stat. 555.

Grants to States for public assistance: For grants to States for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled, as authorized in titles I, IV, X, and XIV of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subchs. I, IV, X, and XIV), \$1,200,000,000, of which such amount as may be necessary shall be available for grants for any period in the prior fiscal year subsequent to March 31 of that year.

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance: For expenses necessary for the Bureau of Public Assistance, \$1,487,500.

Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau: For necessary expenses in carrying out the Act of April 9, 1912, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 6), and title V of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V), including purchase of reports and material for the publications of the Children's Bureau and of reprints for distribution, \$1,525,000: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be used to promulgate or carry out any instructions, order, or regulation relating to the care of obstetrical cases which discriminate between persons licensed under State law to practice obstetrics: *Provided further*, That the foregoing proviso shall not be so construed as to prevent any patient from having the services of any practitioner of her own choice, paid for out of this fund, so long as State laws are complied with: *Provided further*, That any State plan which provides standards for professional obstetrical services in accordance with the laws of the State shall be approved.

Grants to States for maternal and child welfare: For grants to States for maternal and child-health services, services for crippled children, and child-welfare services as authorized in title V, parts 1, 2, and 3, of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. 7), \$30,000,000: *Provided*, That any allotment to a State pursuant to section 502 (b) or 512 (b) of such Act shall not be included in computing for the purposes of subsections (a) and (b) of sections 504 and 514 of such Act an amount expended or estimated to be expended by the State.

Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Commissioner of Social Security, \$173,000, together with not to exceed \$123,500 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to States under titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV, respectively, of the Social Security Act, as amended, for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures made thereunder for payments under each of such titles to be charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year.

In the administration of titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV, respectively, of the Social Security Act, as amended, payments to a State under any of such titles for any quarter in the period beginning April 1 of the prior year, and ending June 30 of the current year, may be made with respect to a State plan approved under such title prior to or during such period, but no such payment shall be made with respect to any plan for any quarter prior to the quarter in which such plan was submitted for approval.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Secretary, \$1,112,500, together with not to exceed \$171,000 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund: *Provided*, That, except as may be otherwise provided for herein, not more than \$200,000 of the funds, including trust funds, appropriated by this title may be used at the departmental level under authority of section 601 of the Act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417), as amended, and section 7 of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953.

Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Services: For expenses necessary for the Office of Field Services, including not less than \$850,000 for the Division of Grant-in-Aid Audits, \$1,800,000, together with not to exceed \$350,000 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

37 Stat. 79.

49 Stat. 629.

49 Stat. 629.

42 USC 702, 712,
704, 714.

42 USC ch. 7.

42 USC ch. 7.

31 USC 686.

67 Stat. 632.

5 USC 133z-15
note.

Salaries and expenses. Office of the General Counsel: For expenses necessary for the Office of the General Counsel, \$350,000, together with not to exceed \$22,500 to be transferred from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, certification and inspection services", and not to exceed \$365,000 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

Surplus property disposal: For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of subsections 203 (j) and (k) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, relating to disposal of real and personal excess property for educational purposes and protection of public health, \$400,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Library membership dues.

SEC. 202. Appropriations under this title available for salaries and expenses shall be available for payment in advance for dues or fees for library membership in organizations whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public.

Services.

SEC. 203. Appropriations under this title available for salaries and expenses shall be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a).

60 Stat. 810.

Travel expenses.

SEC. 204. Appropriations under this title available for salaries and expenses shall be available for travel expenses and not to exceed \$90,000, of which \$45,000 shall be available only to the National Institutes of Health, of such funds shall be available for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the functions or activities for which such appropriations are made.

State agencies for grants in aid.

SEC. 205. None of the funds appropriated by this title to the Social Security Administration for grants in aid of State agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of operation of said agencies including the salaries and expenses of officers and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld from the said agencies of any States which have established by legislative enactment and have in operation a merit system and classification and compensation plan covering the selection, tenure in office, and compensation of their employees, because of any disapproval of their personnel or the manner of their selection by the agencies of the said States, or the rates of pay of said officers or employees.

Motor vehicle transfers.

SEC. 206. The Secretary is authorized to make such transfers of motor vehicles, between bureaus and offices, without transfer of funds as may be required in carrying out the operations of the Department.

Citation of title.

This title may be cited as the "Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1955".

National Labor Relations Board Appropriation Act, 1955.

TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

61 Stat. 136.

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the National Labor Relations Board to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 141-167), and other laws, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Board when specifically authorized by the Chairman or the General Counsel; and services as authorized by section 15

of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; \$8,400,000: *Provided*, 60 Stat. 810.
That no part of this appropriation shall be available to organize or
assist in organizing agricultural laborers or used in connection with 68 Stat. 445.
investigations, hearings, directives, or orders concerning bargaining 68 Stat. 446.
units composed of agricultural laborers as referred to in section 2 (3)
of the Act of July 5, 1935 (49 Stat. 450), and as amended by the Labor- 29 USC 152.
Management Relations Act, 1947, and as defined in section 3 (f) of the 61 Stat. 137.
Act of June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1060), and including in said definition 29 USC 203.
employees engaged in the maintenance and operation of ditches, canals,
reservoirs, and waterways when maintained or operated on a mutual,
nonprofit basis and at least 95 per centum of the water stored or
supplied thereby is used for farming purposes.

This title may be cited as the "National Labor Relations Board
Appropriation Act, 1955". Citation of
title.

TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

National Media-
tion Board Ap-
propriation Act,
1955.

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the National
Mediation Board, including stenographic reporting services as author-
ized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), 60 Stat. 810.
\$425,500.

Arbitration and emergency boards: For expenses necessary for
arbitration boards established under section 7 of the Railway Labor
Act, as amended (45 U. S. C. 157), and emergency boards appointed
by the President pursuant to section 10 of said Act (45 U. S. C. 160), 44 Stat. 582, 586.
including stenographic reporting services as authorized by section 15
of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$300,000. 60 Stat. 810.

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the National Rail-
road Adjustment Board, including stenographic reporting services as
authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), 60 Stat. 810.
\$495,000, of which not less than \$175,000 shall be available for com-
pensation (at rates not in excess of \$75 per diem) and expenses of
referees appointed pursuant to section 3 of the Railway Labor Act, 45 USC 153.
as amended.

This title may be cited as the "National Mediation Board Appro-
priation Act, 1955". Citation of
title.

TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Railroad Retire-
ment Board Ap-
propriation Act,
1955.

Salaries and expenses, Railroad Retirement Board (trust fund):
For expenses necessary for the Railroad Retirement Board, including
not to exceed \$1,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned
with the work of the Board, when specifically authorized by the Board;
and stenographic reporting services as authorized by section 15 of
the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; \$6,108,000, to be derived 60 Stat. 810.
from the railroad retirement account.

This title may be cited as the "Railroad Retirement Board Appro-
priation Act, 1955". Citation of
title.

Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service Appropriation Act, 1955.

61 Stat. 152.

60 Stat. 810.

68 Stat. 446.

68 Stat. 447.

61 Stat. 155.

60 Stat. 810.

Citation of title.

TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Service to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 171-180, 182), including expenses of the Labor-Management Panel as provided in section 205 of said Act; temporary employment of arbitrators, conciliators, and mediators on labor relations at rates not in excess of \$75 per diem; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with labor and industrial relations; and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); \$3,124,000.

Boards of inquiry: To enable the Service to pay necessary expenses of boards of inquiry appointed by the President pursuant to section 206 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 176-180, 182), including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and rent in the District of Columbia, \$10,000.

This title may be cited as the "Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service Appropriation Act, 1955".

TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Strikes or overthrow of Government.

Affidavit.

Penalty.

Publicity or propaganda.

Personnel work.

SEC. 701. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States, or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

SEC. 702. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not authorized by the Congress.

SEC. 703. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one hundred and five, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be con-

sidered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; training; committees of expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting.

This Act may be cited as the "Departments of Labor, and Health, Short title. Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1955."

Approved July 2, 1954.

468-A
25

3

3540 E

U.S.D.A.
SEA/TIS
LAW LIBRARY
ROOM 1408 SOUTH
WASHINGTON D.C. 20250

